



Publications  
OF THE  
University of Pennsylvania

SERIES IN  
Philology and Literature

VOL. VIII NO. 2

THE SOURCES OF PLUTARCH'S  
LIFE OF CICERO

BY

ALFRED GUDEMAN

Sometime Associate Professor of Classical Philology  
University of Pennsylvania

*Published for the University*

PHILADELPHIA

1902

GINN & COMPANY, Selling Agents, 29 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.

P  
25  
P5  
v.8  
no.2











## SERIES IN

VOL. VIII NO. 2

## BY

Sometime Associate Professor of Classical Philology  
University of Pennsylvania

*Published for the University*

PHILADELPHIA

1902

GINN & COMPANY, Selling Agents, 29 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.

$$\begin{array}{r} 52290 \\ \hline 12 \overline{) 5} \quad 5 \overline{) 0} 3 \end{array}$$



TO  
MY FRIEND AND COLLEAGUE  
PROFESSOR CHARLES E. BENNETT  
OF CORNELL UNIVERSITY

THIS MONOGRAPH IS  
GRATEFULLY DEDICATED

P

25

P5

V. 8

no. 2



## THE SOURCES OF PLUTARCH'S LIFE OF CICERO<sup>1</sup>

I. The results of source investigations have but rarely met with an acquiescence at all commensurate with the labor, the acumen, and the learning so often expended upon them. This is due to several causes. In the first place, the entire or partial loss of the original or earlier authorities naturally gives a more or less wide latitude to the constructive imagination, and, in consequence, different conclusions are often drawn from the same concrete material. In the second place, any one who has even superficially examined the contributions in the field of source research must needs have observed that scholars have, with few laudable exceptions, failed to ascertain at the very outset, as far as this is still possible,

<sup>1</sup> BIBLIOGRAPHY: Heeren, *De fontibus etc. Plutarchi*, Göttingen, 1820, pp. 184-187; J. G. Lagus, *Plutarchus vitae Ciceronis scriptor*, Helsingfors, 1846; Linker, *Emendationen zu Sallust in Wiener Akad.* vol. XIII (1854) pp. 266 ff.; H. Klapp, *De vitarum Plutarchi auctoribus Romanis*, Bonn, 1862; G. S. Sibinga, *De Plutarchi in vita Ciceronis fontibus etc.* (c. 1-23), Leiden Diss. 1863; H. Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs in den Biographien der Römer*, Halle, 1865, pp. 129-135; Weizsäcker, *Cicero's ἱστορία u. Plut. in Fleck. Jahrb.* CXI (1875) pp. 417 ff.; Dübi, *Die jüngeren Quellen der Catil. Verschwörung*, ibid. CXIII (1876) pp. 851 ff.; G. Thouret, *De Cic., Asin., . . . rerum Caesar. scriptoribus*, Leipz. Diss. 1877 (= *Leipz. Stud.* I pp. 313 ff.); Schliephacke, *Ueber die griech. Quellen der Catil. Verschwörung*, Goslar, 1877; J. Besser, *De Coniurat. Catil.*, Leipz. Diss. 1880; Ch. Graux, *Introd. to his edition of Dem. and Cic.*, Paris, 1881; E. Schmidt, *De Cic. commentario . . . a Plutarcho . . . expresso*, Jena Diss. 1884; id. *Plut.'s Bericht über die Catil. Verschwörung*, Lübeck, 1885; Thiaucourt, *Étude sur la Conjuration de Cat. de Sall.*, Paris, 1887; K. Buresch, *Die Quellen zu den vorhand. Ber. über die Catil. Verschwörung in Comment. in honorem Ribbeckii*, 1888, pp. 217 ff.; Gudeman, *A New Source in Plutarch's Life of Cicero in Transactions Amer. Philol. Assoc.* vol. XX (1889) pp. 139-158 (cited as *Transact.*); Willrich, *De Coniurat. Catil. fontibus*, Göttingen Diss. 1893; Felke, *De Sallustii Catilina*, Münster Diss. 1894; E. Schwartz, *Bericht über die Catilin. Verschwörung in Hermes* vol. XXXII (1897) pp. 554-609; F. Leo, *Die Griech.-Röm. Biographie etc.*, 1901, pp. 162-165.



what authorities were accessible to the later writer, as well as the extent to which he would be likely to have utilized all the available material—a problem which can only be solved, if soluble at all, by a thorough examination of the working method, as it is revealed in the writings of the particular author under investigation. But even where these conditions have been complied with, a practice has been all but universally followed which in my judgment must be held primarily responsible for the many failures met with in this field of philological study. I refer to the constant practice of at once assuming *direct indebtedness* on the score of more or less striking *coincidences*, whether in form or substance or both, the very probable contingency being too often lost sight of that such parallelisms may have been unavoidable, the similarity of the subject-matter naturally leading to similarity in its stylistic presentation, or that they had passed more or less intact through intermediary channels, or, finally, that two writers were independently indebted to a third source common to both. Unfortunately we are rarely in a position to determine with anything like satisfactory accuracy the real condition of affairs, but there is, at least, one criterion which almost invariably enables us to state dogmatically, if not what actually did happen, at all events what did not. It is a principle which, so far as my observation goes, has hitherto been ignored in source investigations. I have elsewhere had occasion to dwell upon this,<sup>2</sup> but its prime importance for the present study may justify my formulating it again:

*Mere coincidence or similitude of statement with some earlier author, be it never so striking when taken by itself, not only affords no reliable clue to direct indebtedness, but actually renders such an assumption frequently impossible, in case there be found to exist side by side equally noteworthy divergences or contradictions.*

<sup>2</sup> Cp. *Transact. Amer. Philol. Assoc.* vol. XXXI (1900) p. 95 f.; *Introd. to Tac. Germ.* p. I.

It will thus be apparent that the only method that can yield acceptable results will consist in a process of *elimination*, i.e. we must endeavor to determine what predecessors, from out the list possibly accessible, an author could not, for one reason or another, have consulted. It will then be, in many cases, comparatively easy to decide to what extent he probably utilized the authorities still remaining, provided, of course, that their character, purpose, and scope are satisfactorily ascertainable.

II. If we apply these general methodological principles to an investigation into the Sources of Plutarch's Life of Cicero, our first task would naturally be to acquire an adequate conception of his biographical method<sup>1</sup> in regard to the faithfulness or freedom with which he followed still extant authorities<sup>2</sup> and to his habits of citing or suppressing his sources of information. Finally, as we are here dealing with the biography of a Roman, the question also arises whether Plutarch was sufficiently conversant with Latin to enable him to make an intelligent use of the Latin works, so indispensable to a satisfactory treatment of the career of the great orator. That the answer can only be a strong affirmative has been shown elsewhere.<sup>3</sup> As regards the other problems a careful and unbiased examination yields the following conclusions:

The extent of Plutarch's indebtedness to his Roman predecessors is largely conditioned by their number, their character, their exhaustiveness, and their accessibility. It must,

<sup>1</sup> Cp. H. Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs* etc. pp. 1-4; Wachsmuth, *Einleit. in das Stud. d. alt. Gesch. s.n.*; B. Perrin, *Plutarch's Themistocles and Aristides*, New York, 1901, pp. 1-20; Leo l.c. pp. 155 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Especially instructive in this connection is his life of Coriolanus, for which the narrative of Dionysius of Halicarnassus constituted almost the only source. Cf. Peter, *Die Quellen* etc. pp. 7-17.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. *Transact.* p. 140 ff. and the useful but far from exhaustive discussion of Sickinger, *De linguae Latinae apud Plutarchum reliquiis et vestigiis*, Freiburg Diss. 1883. W. Vornefeld, *De scriptorum Latinorum locis a Plutarcho citatis*, Münster Diss. 1901, is superficial and worthless. The famous statement in *Plut. Dem. c. 3* (see Appendix III) merely signifies that he did not feel competent to institute a comparison between Demosthenes and Cicero as orators. Cp. Klapp l.c. p. 3 and Peter, *Die Quellen* etc. p. 61.



therefore, be determined for each biography independently. On the other hand, Plutarch, following the all but universal practice of ancient historians, did not feel called upon to ransack the primary and often widely scattered sources, in case this laborious task had already been satisfactorily performed by others.<sup>4</sup> That this had been done for the life and career of Cicero before Plutarch became his biographer can admit of no doubt. He was, therefore, relieved of the necessity of consulting a great variety of authors who wrote in what was to him after all a foreign, albeit not an unfamiliar language. But quite apart from this consideration, an extensive Latin library was certainly not accessible to him in his small native town which, as he tells us with touching local pride, he did not care to desert, lest it grow less by even one inhabitant. This assumption is, indeed, confirmed by his own words in *Dem.* 2,<sup>5</sup> which must have been written with *special reference to the biography of Cicero*, for the following reasons: In the first place, this complaint would have been unjustified, if he had taken advantage of his residence in Rome to acquaint himself fully with the extensive literature on Cicero at his disposal or had taken pains to collect such traditions concerning him as still survived in the imperial city. In the second place, in composing the life of Demosthenes he was not in the predicament of which he speaks, for all the sources were written in Greek, and the orations, in particular, must have long been familiar to him. The proximity of Athens, moreover, rendered these sources easy of access, and his opportunities for acquiring hearsay information were, to judge from his associations, unquestionably abundant.<sup>6</sup>

Again, Plutarch conforms to the usage of ancient historiography in habitually *suppressing* the authorities whom he most

<sup>4</sup> Cp. H. Peter, *Die geschichtl. Literat.* etc. II, pp. 191 f.; Leo l.c. p. 162.

<sup>5</sup> See Appendix III.

<sup>6</sup> It will not therefore appear accidental that the biography of Cicero contains no such phrases as *Dem.* c. 31, τὸν μὲν οὖν Δημοσθένους ἀπέχεις, Σόστριε, βλὸν ἐξ ὧν ἡμεῖς ἀνέγνωμεν ἢ διηκούσαμεν.



*extensively* followed.<sup>7</sup> Where he does cite them, it is generally with reference to minor details, or because of discrepancies in the traditional records which he did not care or was unable to reconcile. In such cases, he often quotes the account of some noted author which differed from the one accepted by him, and allows the reader to make his own inferences as to their respective validity. The paucity of sources, finally, which we must postulate at all events for Plutarch's Roman Lives, involves the necessary corollary that he did not constantly pass from one to the other, but that he would follow one guide for continuous stretches at a time, digressions or ἐμβλήματα being usually labeled as such by a λέγεται or some similar phrase.

III. Now of the writings which dealt, directly or indirectly, incidentally or exclusively, with the career of Cicero and which were still extant in the days of Plutarch, the following list will probably be found to be fairly exhaustive; for it is unlikely that important sources of information existed of which no trace has survived.\*

I. *Cicero.*

a. \*Υπόμνημα τῆς ὑπατείας.<sup>1</sup>

\**Epistula ad Pompeium*.<sup>2</sup>

\*Poem *de consulatu*, in 3 books (Urania, Minerva, Calliope).<sup>3</sup>

\*Poem *de temporibus suis*,<sup>4</sup> in 3 books.

\**De consiliis suis*.<sup>5</sup>

\* Those marked with an asterisk have not come down to us.

<sup>7</sup> Thus, to mention at least one indubitable instance, the name of Dionysius occurs but *once* in the *Compar. Alc. et Cor.* 2, *never* in the *Camillus*, and yet both the *Coriolanus* (see above p. 3<sup>2</sup>) and the biography of the latter are based upon the account in the *Archaeology*.

<sup>1</sup> Cp. *ad Att.* I. 19, 10; 20, 6; II. 1, 1; *Plut. Caes.* 8; *Crass.* 13; *Dio Cass.* XLVI. 21.

<sup>2</sup> Schol. Bob. p. 270 non mediocris ad instar voluminis scripta; *pro Sull.* 24, 67. Perhaps identical in contents with the Greek memoir.

<sup>3</sup> *Cic. de div.* I. 17-22.

<sup>4</sup> *ad Quint. frat.* III. 1, 24; *ad fam.* I. 9, 23.

<sup>5</sup> Cp. *Ascon. Ped.* p. 831 Or.; *Charisius G. L.* I. 146; *Boethius de inst. mus.* I. 1. It is admittedly identical with the ἀνέκδοτα, and is frequently

- b. *Brutus* (esp. c. 89, 305-92, 316).
- c. *Epistles*.
- d. *Orationes*.
- II. a. \*Tiro, *de vita Ciceronis* — \**de iocis Ciceronis*.
- b. \*C. Trebonius, *de facete dictis Ciceronis*.
- c. \*Corn. Nepos, *de vita Ciceronis*.
- d. \*T. Pomponius Atticus, *Περὶ Κικέρωνος ὑπατείας*.<sup>6</sup>  
\*Herodes, *Περὶ Κικέρωνος ὑπατείας*.<sup>6a</sup>
- III. a. *Political Pamphlets*<sup>7</sup>: e.g. \*Antonius, *Πρὸς τοὺς Φίλιπ-  
πικοὺς ἀναγραφαί* (Cic. c. 41);
- b. *Rhetorical Exercises*: Ps. Sallustii *Invectiva in Ciceronem*  
— [Latro?] *Declamatio in Catilinam* — *Suasoriae* and  
*Controversiae*<sup>8</sup> and perhaps the *De petitione consulatus*,  
attributed to Q. Cicero.
- IV. a. Sallust's *Catiline*.
- b. \*Livy (esp. books 91-120).
- c. \*Asinius Pollio, *Bella Civilia*.
- d. \*Tanusius Geminus, *Historia*; \*M. Bibulus, *Edicta*; \*C.  
Curio, *Orationes*; \*M. Actorius Naso.<sup>9</sup>

mentioned by Cicero himself, e.g. *ad Att.* II. 6, 2; XIV. 17, 6. It is alluded to in Plut. *Crass.* 13, ἐν τινι λόγῳ . . . οὗτος μὲν ὁ λόγος ἐξεδόθη μετὰ τὴν ἀμφοῖν (sc. Crassus and Caesar) τελευτήν, and perhaps *Cic.* 20, ὡς αὐτὸς φησιν (de Terentia). According to Dio Cass. XXXIX. 10, 1 it was sealed and entrusted to his son with the injunction that it should neither be read nor published before his death.

<sup>6</sup> Nepos *Att.* 25, 18, 6; Cic. *ad Att.* II. 1, 1.

<sup>6a</sup> Harshly criticised by Cic. *ad Att.* II. 2 and not mentioned elsewhere.

<sup>7</sup> The virulent speech against Cicero put into the mouth of Fufius Calenus by Dio Cass. XLVI. 1-28 may give us an idea of their character. When the conditions which gave rise to these publications had passed away, they were naturally allowed to perish, and probably but few survived until Plutarch's time. Cp. also Ascon. Ped. p. 95 feruntur orationes illorum (sc. Antonius and Catiline) non ab ipsis scriptae sed ab Ciceronis obtrectatoribus, and, on some others, O. E. Schmidt, *Flugschriften aus der Zeit des 1. Triumvirats* in *Neue Jahrb. f. class. Alt.* IV. 9 (1901) pp. 620-655, and H. Peter, *Geschichtl. Literat.* etc. I, pp. 163 ff.

<sup>8</sup> Sen. *Suas.* VI: Deliberat Cicero an Antonium deprecetur; VII: Deliberat Cicero an scripta sua comburat, promittente Antonio incolumitatem si fecisset; *Controv.* VII. 17: Popillium parricidii reum Cicero defendit, absolutus est. Proscriptum Ciceronem ab Antonio missus occidit Popillius et caput eius ad Antonium rettulit.

<sup>9</sup> With the exception of Bibulus, we owe the mention of these otherwise unknown writers to Suet. *Caes.* 9, where they are cited for the so-called first

- e. \*Cremutius Cordus ; \*Aufidius Bassus ; \*Brutidius Niger.<sup>10</sup>
- V. a. \*Fenestella, *Annales*.
  - b. Asconius Pedianus, *Commentary* to Cicero's *Speeches* (extant: in *Pis.*; *pro Scauro*; *pro Mil.*; *pro Cornelio*; in *tog. cand.*).
- VI. a. \*Diodorus, \*Strabo, and \*Nicolaus Damascenus.
  - b. \*The ante-Plutarchean sources of Appian and Dio Cassius.
- VII. \*Suetonius, *de vita Ciceronis*, a part of the *De viris illustribus*.

It is irrelevant to my present purpose to enumerate even the most important Roman authors referred to directly in Plutarch's voluminous writings,<sup>11</sup> we being here more immediately concerned with his allusions to such as are given in the above list, although the explicit quotation of authorities by no means, as we shall have frequent occasion to see, involves direct knowledge of them — no more, in fact, than the failure to cite them necessarily implies Plutarch's ignorance of their existence.

Plutarch quotes Cicero's *ὑπόμνημα τῆς ὑπατείας* and *ἀνέκδοτα* (*Crass.* 13), his *Laudatio Catonis* (*Cic.* c. 39), and the philosophical works in a vague and general way (c. 24. 40; *Comp. Dem. et Cic.* 2). Out of a total of about a *dozen* references to the Letters and some *twenty* to the Speeches, four<sup>12</sup> of the

conspiracy of Catiline. Cp. *Cic. ad Att.* II. 20, 4, Bibulus hominum admiratione et benevolentia in caelo est. *Edicta* eius et contiones describunt et legunt. They seem to have been directed against Caesar.

<sup>10</sup> Cited by Sen. *Suas.* VI. 18 ff., together with Livy and Pollio, as historians who gave an account of Cicero's assassination.

<sup>11</sup> This is done, with the indication of the passages, if still extant, in *Transact.* p. 124 f. note 4.

<sup>12</sup> It is perhaps not accidental that three of them were written in Greek. Besides these we have allusions to letters of Trebatius (c. 37) and Brutus (*Comp. Dem. et Cic.* 4) to Cicero and one written by Brutus to Atticus (c. 45). A number of items, found in the extant Correspondence, are given without any hint as to their ultimate source, e.g. c. 36, 6, Cicero's answer to a request of Caelius (= *ad fam.* II. 11); some again are introduced by a vague *γράφει ἐν ἐπιστολαῖς* (c. 37) or credited to him by a phrase like *τὰ μὲν οὖν ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς γεγραμμένα τοιαῦτά ἐστιν*. That they were all taken at second or third hand will be shown below.



former and fifteen<sup>13</sup> of the latter occur in the biography of Cicero. *Nepos*, though not the *vita Ciceronis*, is cited five times<sup>14</sup>; *Sallust*, but not the *Catilina*, three times<sup>15</sup>; *Asinius Pollio*<sup>16</sup> and *Tiro's*<sup>17</sup> exhaustive<sup>18</sup> biography twice each. *Livy's*<sup>19</sup> name occurs a dozen times in Plutarch, but nowhere in his Cicero. The latest literary allusion is the incidental reference to the *Memoirs of Augustus*.<sup>20</sup>

To these must be added the far more numerous references to earlier authorities, indicated by vague and general phrases. They often introduce a digression, or incidental observations; nor must the plural number be taken as a proof of a plurality of sources, as it often merely corresponds to an 'on dit,' or was, in some instances, perhaps occasioned by the citation of several authorities in the source directly consulted:

- a. λέγεται, λέγουσιν: c. 1, 1. 28 Si.; 2, 4; 4, 28; 5, 22; 9, 7; 17, 29. 6; 25, 15; 32, 15; 33, 27; 36, 8; 39, 22; 40, 18; 41, 1; 46, 2; 49, 1; *Comp.* 1, 18 — λεγόμεναι: c. 41, 16; 45, 14.
- b. φησί, φασί, τινὲς δέ φασι, ὥς φασιν ἔνιοι: c. 6, 16; 20, 6 (ὥς αὐτὸς φησιν ὁ Κικέρων); 41, 29 — c. 40, 12; 44, 31; 44, 9 — c. 20, 24 — c. 4, 7.
- c. δοκεῖ, ἐδόκει: c. 2, 7; 12, 11; 14, 3; 23, 27; 29, 12.

<sup>13</sup> c. 3 (pro Roscio), 7 (in Verrem), 9 (pro Manilio), 10 ff. (in Cat.), 12 (de leg. agrar.), 24. 48 (Philippica), 35 (pro Murena, pro Milone), 37 (pro Ligario), *Comp.* 1 (pro Caelio), and a number no longer extant, c. 6. 13 (pro Othone) and esp. c. 26. On the reference to the pro Plancio, see below.

<sup>14</sup> *Marc.* 12. 30; *Tib. Gracch.* 21; *Lucull.* 43; *Comp. Pelop. et Marc.* 1.

<sup>15</sup> *Lucull.* 11. 33; *Comp. Lys. et Sull.* 3.

<sup>16</sup> *Caes.* 46; *Pomp.* 72.

<sup>17</sup> *Cic.* 41. 49; *Tac. Dial.* 17; *Gell. N. A.* IV. 10, 5.

<sup>18</sup> The 4th book had not advanced beyond the Clodian episode. Cp. *Ascon. Ped. in Milon.* p. 49.

<sup>19</sup> The citations extend from Bks. V–CXVI. But as Plutarch's perusal of the *Livius ingens Quem mea non totum bibliotheca capit* is quite out of the question, either all these quotations were taken at *second hand*, or else he read an Epitome of Livy, such as is known to have existed in the time of Domitian (*Mart. XIV.* 190; *Stat. Silv.* IV. 7, 53), if not actually as early as the reign of Tiberius.

<sup>20</sup> *Comp. Dem. et Cic.* 3 and *Cic.* 45.

- d. ὥς ἔοικε: c. 1, 23; 35, 6; 44, 17.
- e. ἱστοροῦσιν, ἱστορήται: c. 1, 3; 5, 26; 44, 19—ἐνιοὶ τῶν συγγραφέων ἱστορήκασιν: c. 49, 32.
- f. ἀπομνημονεύουσιν: c. 24, 11—πολλὰ χαρίεντα διαμνημονεύεται: c. 7, 24.
- g. ἦν πυθέσθαι, πυθάνομαι: c. 1, 3—c. 49, 3.
- h. ἃ μὲν οὖν ἄξια μνήμης τῶν περὶ . . . Κικέρωνος ἱστορουμένων εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀφίκεται γνῶσιν, ταῦτ' ἐστίν: *Comp. Dem. et Cic.* c. 1, 22 f.
- i. τὰ βιβλία τελευτῶν κατέπλησε καὶ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν ἐγκωμίων: c. 24, 3—ὥς ἐκ τῶν συγγραμμάτων λαβεῖν ἔστι: c. 24, 10—ἐπαίνων, οἷς' πολλαχοῦ χρῆται περὶ τοῦ ἀνδρός: c. 24, 21—ἔστι δέ τις καὶ τοῦ ἡθους ἐν τοῖς λόγοις ἐκατέρου δίοψις: *Comp. Dem. et Cic.* 1, 5.
- j. τινὲς . . . ἐπιφύονται . . . ἀμνημονοῦσι: c. 24, 18, 24.
- k. τῶν δὲ κατ' αὐτὸν ἐνδόξων . . . οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδεὶς, ὃν οὐκ ἐποίησεν ἐνδοξότερον ἢ λέγων ἢ γράφων εὐμενῶς περὶ ἐκάστου: c. 24, 24 ff.—πολλὰ μὲν Καίσαρι γράφων: c. 37, 32.

IV. This preliminary discussion will, I hope, have paved the way for a detailed examination into the sources of the information contained in Plutarch's Life of Cicero, but, before I proceed to this analysis, I deem it expedient to survey, as briefly as possible, the results at which previous investigators have arrived, particularly as my own conclusions will be found to differ so materially from those which have hitherto been more or less generally accepted.

While opinions have naturally varied as to the precise extent of Plutarch's indebtedness to the several authorities who, in the conviction of scholars, had been consulted by the biographer, substantial unanimity seems to exist as regards the following points: Plutarch, we are assured, unquestionably read and utilized Cicero's *ὑπόμνημα τῆς ὑπατείας*, the Letters and Speeches (of the latter particularly the *Catilinian*, the *Philippics*, and the *pro Plancio*), and the autobiographical chapters of the *Brutus*.

Finally, it is generally held that he was under deep obligations to Sallust's *Catiline* and to Tiro's *de vita Ciceronis* and *de iocis Ciceronis*.

These confident allegations, however, rest upon no foundation. Plutarch, as I hope to demonstrate in the following pages, did not consult for the purpose of this biography a single work of Cicero's nor Sallust's monograph nor Tiro nor Livy. While this part of my analysis is strictly negative in character, I shall also show that Plutarch's biography contains a very considerable amount of information of post-Livian or post-Augustan origin and that one of the principal sources for these portions was none other than Suetonius's *Life of Cicero*.

Va. To begin with the works *expressly cited* by Plutarch, for these quotations must naturally create the impression of having been secured at first hand,<sup>1</sup> we may first take up the *Letters of Cicero*. Now the mere presumption that Plutarch had been acquainted with this unique and inexhaustible thesaurus of historical and autobiographical information at once puts us on the horns of a dilemma: if he was, he must either have read the *entire* correspondence (which, as may be observed in passing, was probably double the size of our extant collection<sup>2</sup>) and then have culled from it, like a modern Drumm, what appeared relevant to his purpose, or else he did not consult any part of it at first hand.

That the latter is the only acceptable alternative can be easily shown. In the first place, Plutarch on his own statement had not the leisure, and, as I have also pointed out above, he could not have had the disposition, to ransack so vast a storehouse for his materials, not to mention that the ancients, with the possible exception of Suetonius,<sup>3</sup> utterly failed to realize

<sup>1</sup> Particularly such expressions as we find in c. 24, *σχεδὸν . . . μὴ καὶ δευτέρα . . . ἐν ὁργῇ τινὶ γέγραπται* 37 τὰ μὲν οὖν ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς γεγραμμένα τοιαῦτά ἐστιν.

<sup>2</sup> We possess in all 864 letters, of which 774 are written by Cicero himself.

<sup>3</sup> The extensive use which he makes of these Letters is all the more noteworthy, because the subjects of his extant writings would not naturally nor



the incomparable value of these contemporary documents.<sup>4</sup> Finally, even if we were to grant, on the strength of the direct and indirect allusions to these Letters, that Plutarch perused only a part of them, the capriciousness of the selection no less than the comparatively trivial information which such reading yielded would still remain quite inexplicable. But if these general considerations should not prove convincing, *positive* evidence that the biographer never read the Correspondence of Cicero will be furnished by c. 37. We are there told that Trebatius wrote to the orator that Caesar would be pleased with the support of Cicero, but if his advanced age should forbid an active participation, he might at least retire to Greece, remaining neutral throughout the impending struggle. Cicero, however, vexed that Caesar did not write to him a personal letter, replied in anger,<sup>5</sup> saying that he would do nothing unworthy of his past career. Plutarch concludes with the clause τὰ μὲν οὖν ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς γεγραμμένα τοιαῦτά ἐστι. Now we still possess a letter of Cicero which seems to refer to this very incident; but unless we gratuitously assume that the allusion is based upon some letter now lost, it differs, in spite of a general agreement, in a number of details sufficiently significant to preclude Plutarch's perusal of the original.<sup>6</sup> Thus, we find nothing in the Latin about

often suggest the expediency of their consultation. We may, therefore, be reasonably certain that he exploited the Correspondence to the fullest extent in his Life of Cicero. Cp. also Macé, *Essai sur Suétone* pp. 284-298 (*Cicéron chez Suétone*).

<sup>4</sup> Cp. H. Peter, *Der Brief in der röm. Literatur*, 1901, p. 51.

<sup>5</sup> The Greek does not make it clear, whether the letter was sent to Caesar or to Trebatius. If the former is meant, the discrepancy pointed out above would be still greater.

<sup>6</sup> *ad. Att.* VII. 17, 3: Trebatius quidem scribit se ab illo . . . rogatum esse ut scriberet ad me ut essem ad urbem, nihil ei me gratius facere posse. Haec verbis plurimis. Intellexi ex dierum ratione, ut primum de discessu nostro Caesar audisset, laborare eum coepisse, ne omnes abessemus. . . . Illud admiror non ipsum ad me scripsisse (= θαυμάσας ὅτι Καῖσαρ αὐτὸς οὐκ ἔγραψεν) . . . rescripsi ad Trebatium — nam ad ipsum Caesarem qui mihi nihil scripsisset nolui (ἀπεκρίνατο πρὸς ὁργήν!) — quam illud hoc tempore difficile esse . . . sin

Caesar's proposal of eventual neutrality, nothing which would justify the assertion that Cicero replied *πρὸς ὀργήν*. Finally, the extant collection contains a number of letters which passed between these parties at this time, and they are all couched in friendly terms.<sup>7</sup> They throw considerable light upon the attitude of the two men toward each other, and yet we are asked to believe that Plutarch overlooked these altogether while he inaccurately reproduced the tenor of another!

V<sup>b</sup>. So much for the *Letters*.<sup>1</sup> I pass on to the *Speeches*. In the detailed account of the Catilinian Conspiracy, the famous orations are expressly alluded to in *four*<sup>2</sup> places, coincidences with Plutarch's narrative are also numerous, and hence scholars have had no hesitation in ascribing a direct knowledge of them to the biographer. But if ever mere coincidences have proved to be worthless as evidence of direct indebtedness, it would be in this case, for the reason that this episode was certainly dealt with at greater or less length in all histories or biographies of Cicero, and hence the salient, well-established facts are related with substantial unanimity in Cicero, Sallust, Appian, Florus, and Dio, to mention only the extant accounts. It is in the arrangement of the subject-matter and in details that divergences are revealed, and they are all incompatible with the assumption that Plutarch had carefully perused the original records. A few particularly significant illustrations will suffice:

In Cic. *in Cat.* I. 4, 9, we read: *reperi sunt duo equites Romani qui . . . me meo in lectulo interfecturos pollicerentur . . . exclusi eos quos Catilina mane ad me salutatum miserat*. Here no names are given, but in the *pro Sulla* 6, 18 one *Cornelius* is introduced as *qui me in sedibus meis in conspectu uxoris meae ac liberorum meorum trucidaret*, and bellum geretur, non deero officio nec dignitati meae, pueros ὑπεκθέμενος in Graeciam (ὡς οὐδὲν ἀνάξιον πράξει τῶν πεπολιτευμένων).

<sup>7</sup> *ad Att.* IX. 6 a. 16; X. 8 b (ad Ciceronem); IX. 11 a (ad Caesarem).

<sup>1</sup> For other evidence, see notes to the text (Appendix I).

<sup>2</sup> c. 14. 16. 19. 21.



he also figures in Sall. *Cat.* 28, together with L. Vargunteius, a senator, as a would-be assassin of Cicero. Now in Plut. c. 16 two others, Cethegus and one Marcius, are mentioned as those who had been delegated for this murderous task; he also knows the informant who warned Cicero and adds the absurd detail *κωλυθέντες εἰσελθεῖν ἡγανάκτουν καὶ κατεβόων ἐπὶ θύραις, ὥστε ὑποπτότεροι γενέσθαι*.<sup>3</sup>

Doubtless the names of these men were originally unknown, but subsequently suspicion fastened upon several conspirators, which gave rise to the variants in our extant accounts of the episode. Whether the correct one is found among them is indeterminable and immaterial, but there can be no question that neither the *first* speech against Catiline nor the *pro Sulla* could have been Plutarch's source, and, to anticipate the discussion below, *Sallust* is, at least for this particular item, also excluded.

Again, in *Cat.* II. 2, 4, Cicero says *moleste tuli quod ex urbe parum comitatus exierit. Utinam ille omnes secum copias eduxisset*, and this is confirmed by Sall. *Cat.* 32, *cum paucis in Manliana castra profectus est*, whereas Plutarch c. 16 reports *μετὰ τριακοσίων ὀπλοφόρων . . . πρὸς τὸν Μάλλιον ἐχώρει*.

Cic. in *Cat.* III. 3, 6, 5, 10 speaks of a large number of daggers and swords having been found in the house of Cethegus, but Plut. c. 18 adds hemp and sulphur and that the weapons were all *νεοθήκτους*.

According to *in Cat.* III. 4, 8, *urbem ex omnibus partibus quem ad modum descriptum distributumque erat, incendissent*. Sallust *Cat.* 43 and Appian II. 3 mention *twelve* districts. Plut. c. 18, on the other hand, says 100 men were assigned to as many districts, and adds further details not found elsewhere, but ignores L. Cassius (*in Cat.* III. 6, 14; IV. 6, 13).

<sup>3</sup> Appian's account (II. 3) is still more circumstantial and in flat contradiction with both Cicero and Plutarch. He says *Lentulus* and *Cethegus* intended to entice Cicero into taking an early morning walk and then by engaging him in conversation and thus drawing him away from his people to murder him. Dio Cass. 37, 32 mentions only *δύο τινάς*.

The story of Cicero's energetic measures to crush the conspiracy in the bud, of his shrewd dealings with the Allobrogi, and of the exposure in the senate, so graphically told in *Cat.* III. 2, 4 ff., again differs in important details from the narrative in Plut. c. 18. We may conclude with one other example, though the list of discrepancies is by no means exhausted. When Plut. c. 21 says that Cicero after hearing Caesar's plea for clemency immediately ἀναστὰς ἐνεχείρησεν εἰς ἑκάτερον τὰ μὲν τῇ προτέρᾳ, τὰ δὲ τῇ γνώμῃ Καίσαρος συνειπών, οἱ τε φίλοι πάντες οἰόμενοι τῷ Κικέρωνι συμφέρειν τὴν Καίσαρος γνώμην etc., it must be evident that he never read the *fourth* speech against Catiline.<sup>4</sup>

A similar analysis of Plutarch's statements in c. 12 (*de lege agraria*), c. 23 (where, e.g., Cato is said to have been the first to hail Cicero as *pater patriae*, whereas he himself<sup>5</sup> mentions Q. Catulus), his account of the trial of Roscius (c. 3),<sup>6</sup> of Verres (c. 7 f.), of Milo and Murena (c. 35), can leave no doubt in any unprejudiced mind that the biographer had not consulted these speeches. Finally, even the *pro Plancio* must be eliminated from the list of Plutarch's possible sources, although Cicero is expressly cited as his authority. The juxtaposition and analysis of the two passages will make this clear:

*pro Plancio* 26, 64 f. : Vere me hercule hoc dicam : Sic tum existimabam, nihil homines aliud Romae nisi de quaestura mea loqui . . . excogitati quidam erant a Siculis honores in me inauditi : itaque hac spe decedebam, ut mihi populum Romanum ultro omnia delaturum putarem. At ego cum casu diebus iis itineris faciendi causa decedens e provincia Puteolos forte venissem . . . concidi

Plut. *Cic.* c. 6 : ἐπὶ τοῖς τοῖς οὖν μέγα φρονῶν εἰς Ῥώμην βαδίζων γελοῖόν τι παθεῖν φησιν. Συντυχὼν γὰρ ἀνδρὶ τῶν ἐπιφανῶν φιλῷ δοκοῦντι περὶ Καμπανίαν, ἐρέσθαι, τίνα δὴ τῶν πεπραγμένων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ λόγον ἔχουσι Ῥωμαῖοι καὶ τί

<sup>4</sup> This view is also advocated by Sibinga l.c. p. 77, though he regards this oration as non-Ciceronian.

<sup>5</sup> *in Pis.* 3, 6; *pro Sextio* 57, 121. Both of these speeches are full of biographical detail which Plutarch would not likely have ignored had he known them. And the same is true of many others in the Ciceronian collection.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Sibinga l.c. pp. 16-19, and notes to text.



paene, iudices, cum ex me quidam quaesis-  
set, quo die Roma exissem et num quid-  
nam novi. Cui cum respondissem me e  
provincia decedere, "Etiam me hercule,"  
inquit, "ut opinor, ex Africa." Huic ego  
iam stomachans fastidiose "Immo ex Sici-  
lia" inquam. Tum quidam quasi qui omnia  
sciret, "Quid tu nescis," inquit, "hunc  
quaestorem Syracusis fuisse?" . . . ea res,  
iudices, haud scio an plus mihi profuerit,  
quam si mihi tum essent omnes gratulati.  
Nam posteaquam sensi populi Romani aures  
hebetiores, oculos autem esse acres atque  
acutos, destiti quid de me audituri essent  
homines, cogitare; feci ut postea cotidie  
praesentem me viderent, habitavi in oculis,  
pressi forum.

φρονούσιν, ὡς ὀνόματος καὶ  
δόξης τῶν πεπραγμένων  
αὐτῷ τὴν πόλιν ἅπασαν ἐμ-  
πεπληκώς· τὸν δ' εἰπὼν·  
"Ποῦ γὰρ ἦς, ὦ Κικέρων,  
τὸν χρόνον τοῦτον;" τότε  
μὲν οὖν ἐξαθυμῆσαι παντά-  
πασιν, εἰ καθάπερ εἰς πέλα-  
γος ἀχανὲς τὴν πόλιν ἐμπε-  
σὼν ὁ περὶ αὐτοῦ λόγος  
οὐδὲν εἰς δόξαν ἐπίδηλον  
πεποίηκεν· ὕστερον δὲ λο-  
γισμὸν ἑαυτῷ διδοὺς πολὺ  
τῆς φιλοτιμίας ὑφεῖλεν, ὡς  
πρὸς ἀόριστον πρᾶγμα τὴν  
δόξαν ἀμυλλώμενος καὶ  
πέρας οὐκ ἐφικτὸν ἔχουσιν.

That the *ultimate* source of this exquisite story was the Ciceronian speech is, of course, self-evident, only Plutarch could not possibly have had it before his eyes when he penned this paragraph,<sup>7</sup> so thoroughly spoiled has it been in the retelling. Thus, the best part of the joke turns upon the interlocutor's failure to distinguish *Lilybaeum*, Cicero's district, from *Syracuse*, the two together forming the province of Sicily. Plutarch knew nothing of this and calmly speaks of Cicero as quaestor of Sicily. Again, according to the original Cicero made an excursion, in Plutarch he has left his province at the expiration of his term of office. In the Latin an unknown individual puts the annoying question, in the Greek Cicero questions an eminent friend. Cicero is very explicit as to the locality, Plutarch speaks vaguely of Campania. In the Latin, once more, we have the delightful colloquy which culminates in Cicero's complete discomfiture, in the Greek only a simple question is asked. Finally, Cicero's application of the story, and the lesson he drew from the

<sup>7</sup> This is also recognized by H. Peter, *Die Quellen* etc. p. 130, and by Sibinga 1c. p. 26-28.

incident, are partly omitted, partly misunderstood, and partly contradicted in the clumsy reproduction. Certainly no Roman biographer or historian, such as Tiro, Nepos, Livy, or Suetonius, could have transmitted this anecdote in the emasculated shape in which we find it in Plutarch. It represents doubtless what in modern parlance would be called a newspaper clipping, a stray item which Plutarch may have come upon in some of the many post-Augustan collectanea of *rerum memorabilium* and which he had hastily transferred to his Commonplace Book, or else he was here quoting a story he had once heard, but had imperfectly retained in his memory.

A close analysis, then, of Plutarch's references to Cicero's orations, whether direct or indirect, can, I feel convinced, justify but one conclusion: to wit, that, while he may have glanced at some speeches, he did not use them as biographical sources of information.<sup>8</sup>

Vc. That Cicero's *Brutus*, especially the famous autobiographical chapters at the close, was consulted by Plutarch seems to be universally admitted, this conviction being based upon c. 3 and 4, which are chiefly devoted to the philosophical and rhetorical training of the young Cicero. No doubt the numerous coincidences existing between the two accounts, more particularly the enumeration of the Asianic rhetoricians, might lend color to this supposition, for even Strabo, the only later writer who besides Plutarch speaks of them, cites the *Brutus* as his authority.<sup>1</sup> And yet Plutarch cannot have read a line of this work, so glaring are the contradictions. In the first place, Plutarch's knowledge of the history of Greek philosophy and rhetoric was unquestionably profound and extensive, and he was not, therefore, called upon to consult a

<sup>8</sup> We possess 54 speeches entire, 17 in fragments, and we know the titles, in some cases also the contents, of 30 more. Plutarch, therefore, had he desired to read some of Cicero's speeches, would have been confronted with a collection of over *one hundred* from which to choose! See Appendix I.

<sup>1</sup> Strabo XIII. 660.



Latin writer for his information on these subjects.<sup>2</sup> But we are happily not compelled to rely upon such considerations. If Plutarch read the *Brutus*, how was it possible that he should represent Cicero as leaving Rome immediately after the Roscian trial, whereas Cicero says expressly that he remained two years longer actively engaged in forensic occupation until his health gave out, a statement which Plutarch, after asserting that it was put forth as a pretext by the orator to conceal his cowardly departure out of fear of Sulla, confirms in the very next paragraph? Again, Plutarch makes him return on the news of the dictator's death, whereas Cicero did not do so until two years later, when, as he tells us himself, the objects which had caused him to leave Rome had been attained. Finally, in the enumeration of Cicero's teachers Plutarch omits Demetrius the Syrian and Aeschylus the Cnidian, but adds Posidonius and refers to Molo as Apollonius the son of Molo. Posidonius, although his name occurs no fewer than eighteen times in the extant writings of Cicero, is referred to but twice, and that in a parenthetical way, as the orator's *teacher*; but these passages were certainly unknown to Plutarch, not to mention that neither the time when nor the place where Cicero enjoyed his instruction is there given.<sup>3</sup> The confusion between *Apollonius* ὁ μαλακός, much the older man, and *Molo*, Cicero's teacher both in Rome and in Rhodes,<sup>4</sup> furnishes still another proof that Plutarch was not indebted to the *Brutus*. Their identification, it is true, is extremely common both in Greek and Latin writers after the time of Cicero, Strabo, and Valerius Maximus,<sup>5</sup> the

<sup>2</sup> If his biographical source had said no more than that Cicero had been a pupil of Rhodian rhetoricians, their names would readily suggest themselves to him. But if he found them already mentioned, there is only one biographer of Cicero known to us who would be likely to have done so, namely *Suetonius*, the author of the *de grammaticis et rhetoribus*.

<sup>3</sup> *de fato* 3, 5. *Posidonius* quaedam (pace magistri dixerim) comminisci videtur; *de nat. deor.* I. 3, 5. Diodotus, Philo, Antiochus, *Posidonius* a quibus instituti sumus.

<sup>4</sup> *Brut.* 89, 307. 90, 312. 91, 316.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Susemihl, *Gesch. der alex. Lit.* II. pp. 489-493.

younger rhetorician being referred to often as Apollonius or Apollonius Molo — for Plutarch's Ἀπολλωνίῳ τῷ Μόλωνος<sup>1</sup> is in my judgment due to a misunderstanding of his Latin source, which probably contained the genitive *Apollonii Molonis*, he being ignorant of the fact that the Latin, unlike the Greek, does not express descent by the genitive case.

V<sup>d</sup>. Of the writings of Cicero still to be discussed there remain only his poems *de consulatu* and *de temporibus suis*, the Greek *Memoir on his Consulship* and the *de consiliis suis* or ἀνέκδοτα. On general considerations, it is to the highest degree improbable that Plutarch utilized any of the poetic<sup>2</sup> effusions for his narrative, although certain items may be ultimately based upon them, as the following passage in Servius ad Verg. *Ecl.* VIII. 104 f. seems to show: hoc uxori Ciceronis *dicitur* contigisse, cum post peractum sacrificium libare vellet, in cinerem ex ipso cinere flamma surrexit quae flamma eodem anno consulem futurum ostendit eius maritum, sicut *Cicero in suo testatur poemate*. This same omen is related by Dio Cass. 37, 35 and with circumstantiality of detail in Plut. *Cic.* 20, Terentia's characterization being introduced by the words ὡς αὐτὸς φησιν ὁ Κικέρων. What more probable, than that the poem *de consulatu* is the original source of both Dio and Plutarch! A closer examination, however, reveals considerable objections to this assumption. In the first place, Servius, who, as the *dicitur* perhaps indicates, cites only at second hand, places the incident at an earlier time, when Cicero was again a private citizen, whereas Plutarch expressly informs us that the annual festival of the Bona Dea always took place in the house of the

<sup>1</sup> So again in Plut. *Caes.* 3, but not elsewhere. It is, however, significant to note in this connection that Suet. *Caes.* 4 also speaks of Apollonius Molo where Molo was meant.

<sup>2</sup> The one solitary allusion to a Latin poet, throughout all the voluminous writings of Plutarch, is found in *Lucull.* 39, where the reference to Horace (viz. *Epist.* I. 6, 40 ff.), if not an actual interpolation, as I still believe it to be, is in any case taken at second or third hand. Cp. *Transact.* p. 149 note 16.



consul,<sup>3</sup> and that Cicero accordingly went to the residence of a neighbor, there to deliberate upon the best mode of dealing with the conspirators. In the second place, the interpretation of the omen, as well as the time of its occurrence, exhibits noteworthy divergences. If we are to believe Servius, Cicero himself spoke of it as having happened before he was elected; according to Plutarch and Dio (who, however, makes no mention of the Bona Dea or of Terentia) the miracle occurred shortly before the famous debate in the senate and was interpreted as justifying Cicero in insisting on the death penalty.<sup>4</sup> Again, the deliberations of the consul in Plutarch follow the arrest of the conspirators, whereas in Sallust c. 46 they are made to precede the sensational exposure, and there is no allusion to the prodigy.

The narrative in Plutarch is homogeneous throughout and not marred by any irrelevant additions. Now, unless we gratuitously maintain that the authority of Cicero is specially invoked for the sole purpose of substantiating the parenthetical remark concerning Terentia, while the truth of the curious story immediately preceding was allowed to stand on its own merits, we must conclude that the entire passage was culled from one and the same source. But if so, this authority cannot have been the Ciceronian poem, even if we lay no stress upon the chronological difficulty in Servius for the reasons given above. The Greek Memoir, on the other hand, is no less out of the question, and that chiefly for two

<sup>3</sup> Dio Cass. l.c. ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ, but in c. 45 he speaks of these ceremonies as taking place *παρὰ τε τοῖς ὑπάτοις καὶ παρὰ τοῖς στρατηγοῖς*. May not this statement be ultimately due to some scholar, like Fenestella, who wished to reconcile the conflicting chronology in the traditional accounts of this incident?

<sup>4</sup> Dio, however, places the incident early in the morning, Plutarch in the evening. In the former again τὸ πῦρ ἐπὶ μακρότατον παρὰ τὸ εἰκὸς ἦρθη, in the latter ἐκ τῆς τέφρας καὶ τῶν κεκαυμένων φλοιῶν φλόγα πολλὴν ἀνῆκε καὶ λαμπράν. Plutarch and Dio, therefore, unquestionably followed different authorities.

reasons: In the first place, Cicero's own reflections<sup>5</sup> could not have assumed the condemnatory form which Plutarch has given to them (*αὐτός τε δόξειν ἄνανδρος καὶ μαλακός* etc.); in the second place, the disparaging remarks concerning his wife could not well have been made at a time when their estrangement had not yet taken place, the *ὑπόμνημα* having been written in 60 B.C. In the *ἀνέκδοτα* published after the divorce they might, of course, have occurred, but then there is no evidence that this work rehearsed the story of the conspiracy from the beginning, nor are we justified in ascribing to Plutarch any first-hand acquaintance with the *ἀνέκδοτα* on the strength of so vague a reference as the *ἐν τινι λόγῳ* etc. in his Life of Crassus.<sup>6</sup>

That the *ὑπόμνημα τῆς ὑπατείας*, on the other hand, cited in the same passage, had been read by Plutarch, it were no less rash to conclude from this solitary and incidental allusion; and yet, since the time of Heeren, scholars have with ever-increasing confidence maintained that we must indeed recognize in this Greek Memoir the principal, if not actually the only, source of Plutarch's information on this subject.<sup>7</sup> We shall see subsequently that there is no satisfactory evidence for this assumption.

VI. Turning to a consideration of Sallust's *De coniuratione Catilinae*, it might be supposed that a comparison between the *extant* monograph and the account in Plutarch would definitely settle any question as to the indebtedness of the

<sup>5</sup> These deliberations seem to be ultimately based upon a *suasoria*, possibly suggested by Sallust l.c., and entitled: *Deliberat Cicero an coniuratores interficiat*. See also p. 6<sup>8</sup>. If so, a post-Augustan origin for this chapter, probable on independent grounds, would be revealed.

<sup>6</sup> See above p. 7.

<sup>7</sup> So e.g. Weizsäcker, Schmidt in special treatises, Buresch, Willrich, and, preceding them all, Sibinga, whose discussion is, however, strangely ignored by the German advocates of the hypothesis. Heeren, as usual, merely postulates it as a fact. Peter, *Die Quellen* etc. p. 129 f., seems to be the only critic who denies Plutarch's indebtedness to the *ὑπόμνημα*, though he does so on insufficient grounds.

one to the other; and, as a matter of fact, the great majority of scholars are convinced that Plutarch did make a more or less extensive use of the Sallustian narrative, a conclusion which rests solely on the unquestionably numerous coincidences between them. But the equally numerous divergences in matters of detail, certain chronological discrepancies, the different attitude of Sallust and Plutarch toward the principal actors in the drama, the noteworthy circumstance, finally, that they have not a single item of information in common which is either omitted or contradicted in all other extant sources, these are facts which certainly far outweigh in significance and argumentative validity the existing parallelisms, the more so as the latter reveal no peculiarities in style or substance which might seem incompatible with a non-Sallustian origin. Many of these dissimilarities have, of course, been noticed; but so far from their leading to the only inference which is psychologically reasonable, namely that Plutarch could never have consulted Sallust, we are seriously asked to believe that Plutarch, while industriously appropriating Sallust's material, had from some unaccountable, capricious fancy repeatedly and suddenly abandoned his guide, in order to incorporate from other sources numerous items which partly contradict or modify or expand his previous basic narrative. That such a patchwork method, even if it were justly attributable to Plutarch, must have resulted in producing an incoherent mosaic instead of an admittedly consistent and homogeneous narrative, goes without saying; and yet it is precisely some such conception which underlies many of the source analyses to which Plutarch's Lives have been subjected.

In order to establish the falsity of the current belief, it will only be necessary to enumerate some of the more flagrant contradictions between the two authors.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For others see Schmidt, Lübeck Progr. l. c. pp. 2-7, who, wholly intent upon proving Plutarch's extensive indebtedness to Cicero's *ὑπόμνημα*, is of course compelled to eliminate Sallust as far as possible as one of his sources. See also notes in Appendix I.



In Sallust c. 23. 25. 28, we read how Q. Curius and Fulvia came to reveal to Cicero the secrets of the conspirators. In Plutarch, on the other hand, the name of Curius is conspicuous by its absence, and Fulvia's information is confined to the contemplated assassination of the consul at the hands of Marcius and Cethegus, for whom Sallust substitutes C. Cornelius and L. Vargunteius.

In Sallust c. 30, *L. Saenius*, a senator, announces the suspicious movements of Manlius in Etruria, a few days *after* the famous decree *videant consules* etc. had been passed; in Plutarch c. 15 this information is given by *Q. Arrius* and it is immediately *followed* by the same decree.

In Sallust c. 30, Q. Metellus Creticus and Q. Metellus Celer are mentioned among a number of other generals as having been dispatched by a *decree of the senate* to prevent or quell any uprisings in other cities; in Plutarch c. 16 Q. Metellus, without the distinguishing cognomen, is appointed by Cicero himself as commander-in-chief (τὰ μὲν ἔξω πράγματα Κ. Μ. διεπίστευσε).

In Sallust c. 32, Catiline *cum paucis in Manliana castra profectus est*; in Plutarch c. 16 μετὰ τριακοσίων ὀπλοφόρων . . . πρὸς τὸν Μάλλιον ἐχώρει. Neither can this passage nor Sall. c. 43, *Statilius et Gabinius uti cum magna manu duodecim simul opportuna loca urbis incenderent* etc., have been the source of Plut. c. 18, as already pointed out above (p. 13). We may add that the Greek author says that *μία τῶν Κρονιάδων* was selected for the deed, whereas no date at all is given in the Latin.

The story of the arrest of the conspirators (Sall. c. 47 and Plut. c. 19) also exhibits noteworthy discrepancies. Thus the latter says that they were handed over to the praetors, but Sallust gives the names of all the custodians, and there is not a praetor among them; nor does he add the picturesque, albeit absurd, touch, that Lentulus on abdicating immediately exchanged his senatorial toga for a garb of mourning, ἐν τῇ

βουλῇ καταθέμενος, he having probably brought it with him for just such a contingency! Stress has been laid upon the phrases *abdicato magistratu* and *in liberis custodiis habeantur* as closely corresponding to ἀπωμόσατο τὴν ἀρχὴν and παρέδοθησαν εἰς ἄδεσμον φυλακὴν; but, even if the parallelisms were more exact than they are, how, we ask, could a verbal resemblance<sup>2</sup> in statements of this kind be avoided? The same holds true of other verbal similarities.

Plutarch c. 10, after attributing to Catiline two atrocious crimes which are not mentioned in Sallust, says ἄλλας τε πίστεις ἀλλήλοις ἔδοσαν καὶ καταθύσαντες ἄνθρωπον ἐγένεσαντο τῶν σαρκῶν. Sall. c. 22 also refers to these pledges, but speaks only of the drinking of a mixture of human blood and wine and then adds the significant remark: *nonnulli ficta et haec et multa praeterea existumabant ab eis qui Ciceronis invidiam quae postea orta est leniri credebant atrocitate sceleris eorum qui pocnas dederunt. Nobis ea res pro magnitudine parum comperta est.*

In the account of the memorable debate in the senate, Sallust c. 50 f. mentions Tiberius Nero<sup>3</sup> as the one who first proposed the milder sentence and says nothing of the opposition of Lutatius Catulus; Plutarch on the other hand (c. 20) omits the name of Nero and maintains that all followed the first speaker Silanus in recommending the death penalty, until it came to Caesar.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> So Dio XXXVII. 34 says of Lentulus: ἀπειπεῖν τὴν στρατηγίαν, Appian II. 5 ἡ βουλὴ Λέντλον παρέλυσε τῆς ἀρχῆς and Cic. *in Cat.* III. 6, 15, *magistratu se abdicavit.*

<sup>3</sup> So also Appian II. 5, whose narrative is otherwise independent of Sallust and in closer agreement with Plutarch.

<sup>4</sup> προσετίθεντο τούτῳ πάντες ἐφεξῆς μέχρι Γαῖου Καίσαρος and *Cat. Min.* 22 οἱ δὲ μετ' αὐτὸν ἐφεξῆς ἠκολούθησαν ἄχρι Καίσαρος Dio Cass. XXXVII. 36, ὁ Καῖσαρ, πάντων πρὸ αὐτοῦ ψηφισμένων ἀποθανεῖν σφᾶς, γνώμην ἔδωκε etc. So also Cic. *Cat.* IV. 4, 7, *duae dictae sunt sententiae: una D. Silani . . . altera C. Caesaris; ad Att.* XII. 21, 1, *illud turpiter ignorat (sc. Brutus): Catonem primum putat de animadversione dixisse, quam omnes ante dixerant praeter Caesarem; et cum ipsius Caesaris tam severa fuerit, qui tum praetorio loco*

It is needless to multiply illustrations. These discrepancies, when added to the well-known facts that Plutarch and Sallust do not agree in their chronology, that the Greek account is written from a decidedly Ciceronian standpoint with only an occasional unfriendly note, and, finally, that the whole creates the impression of being a consistent narrative and not a piece of patchwork made up of ill-assorted stones taken from numerous quarries,<sup>5</sup> make it clear that Sallust cannot under any circumstances be regarded as a direct source of Plutarch's information regarding the conspiracy.

VII. The question as to Plutarch's possible indebtedness to *Livy*, though this is improbable for the reason given above (p. 8<sup>19</sup>), is intimately associated with the determination of the sources of Dio Cassius, whose acquaintance with the *libri ab urbe condita*, whether in the original or in the Epitome, is reasonably certain.<sup>1</sup> But the extent to which he consulted this authority must ever remain problematical, in view of the fact that Dio's first-hand knowledge of contemporary historical sources covering the period of Cicero's career (for it is with this that we are here alone concerned) is equally well established,<sup>2</sup> although we are not justified in crediting him

dixerit, consularium putat leniores fuisse Catuli, Servilii, Lucullorum, Curionis, Torquati, Lepidi, Gellii, Volcatii, Figuli, Cottae, L. Caesaris, C. Pisonis, etiam M'. Glabrionis, Silani, Murenæ, designatorum consulum, and Suet. *Caes.* 14, *senatu universo . . . ultimam statuente poenam, solus . . . censuit.*

<sup>5</sup> The technical difficulty involved in such a process for an ancient investigator has been well pointed out by Nissen, *Ueber die Quellen der 4. u. 5. Dekade des Livius*, 1865, p. 78, although the famous One Source Theory which he deduces from it cannot be accepted without very considerable modifications and restrictions.

<sup>1</sup> Cp. e.g. M. Grasshoff, *de fontibus et auctoritate Dionis Cassii*, Bonn Dissert. 1867; W. Heimbach, *Quæritur quid Dio . . . a libro 40 usque ad librum 47 e Livio desumpserit*, Bonn Dissert. 1878; Willrich l.c. pp. 43-52.

<sup>2</sup> E.g., the long speech put into the mouth of Cicero (Dio XLV. 18-45) exhibits a first-hand acquaintance especially with the second Philippic oration. Cp. I. G. Fischer, *de fontibus et auctoritate Cassii Dionis in enarrandis a Cicerone post Caesaris mortem . . . habitis orationibus*, Leipzig 1870. And the reply of Calenus (XLVI, 1-28) is probably very extensively indebted to Antonius's speech (Sept. 19, 43) and the pamphlet literature of the day.



with the extensive reading of the works of Cicero, Sallust, and others, attributed to him by many scholars.<sup>3</sup> Under these circumstances it is impossible to say with any degree of confidence to what extent Dio was directly indebted to Livy for those events in which Cicero was a conspicuous participant. If Dio's strange hostility toward the man was in any way conditioned by the character of his sources, then Livy's alleged influence must be confined within still narrower limits, for his attitude toward Cicero was demonstrably favorable, though his admiration for the orator need not have blinded him to the defects of the statesman. But, be this as it may, if Livy must needs be regarded as a *fons primarius* of Dio, then Plutarch's Cicero could not also have been under obligations to him,<sup>4</sup> the chiefly unavoidable coincidences with Dio here too not counterbalancing the significant divergences in matters of detail and in the general historical setting, so to speak, which an unprejudiced comparison brings to light.

VIII. *Appian*, especially in his account of the Conspiracy, contains some remarkable parallelisms<sup>1</sup> with Plutarch. Some scholars have accordingly maintained that the historian directly consulted the biographer, while others contended that they were both indebted to a common third source, such as Cicero's *ὑπόμνημα*, Sallust, Livy, or Asinius Pollio.<sup>2</sup> Appian's

<sup>3</sup> Especially R. Wilmans, *De fontibus et auctoritate Dionis Cassii* (lib. 36-52), Berlin Diss. 1835; Peter and Besser ll.cc.

<sup>4</sup> This is certainly true of the narrative of Cicero's death, as may be seen from Livy's account, preserved by Seneca Rhetor, *Suas.* VI. If what Val. Max. IX. 12, 7 says of Licinius Macer is based, like so much of his material, upon Livy, then Plut. c. 9, who deals with the same incident, is also quite independent of the historian.

<sup>1</sup> See notes to the text.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Willrich l.c. pp. 38-42, with the literature there cited, to which may be added C. Peter, *Zur Kritik der Quellen der älteren röm. Gesch.*, 1879, pp. 132-138; Witte, *De Nicolai Damasceni fragmentorum Romanorum fontibus*, Berlin 1900; and E. Schwartz's article in Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencycl.* s.v. According to Soltau, he made an extensive use of Asinius Pollio through the medium of Strabo, Nicolaus, and Socrates Rhodius, the same material being also transmitted to Plutarch by several Greek 'go-betweens.'

partiality for Augustus and his equally marked unfriendliness toward Cicero, combined with many palpable errors which Plutarch does not share with him, are sufficient to disprove the above hypotheses. Everything, on the contrary, goes to show that Appian's narrative is to a large extent a hasty and slipshod compilation, based upon sources which I do not venture to name, but which, unless all signs fail, betray a *post-Augustan* origin.

IX<sup>a</sup>. *Tiro's* biography of his patron was unquestionably as exhaustive as it was authoritative, for it was based upon a most intimate knowledge of the orator's works and a deep familiarity with his character and conduct, acquired through life-long association in the capacity of literary executor, amanuensis, and friend. Nor can there be any doubt that considerable information came to him from the living lips of Cicero himself. That it long remained the standard authority on the subject may perhaps be inferred from the fact that a century later Tacitus cites Tiro for the date of Cicero's death.<sup>1</sup> Its eulogistic and apologetic character would certainly have attracted rather than repelled a man like Plutarch; and, as we find that Tiro is actually cited *twice*, the conclusion that he had been consulted directly may seem irresistible. Hence we are not surprised to find that scholars are well-nigh unanimous in regarding Tiro's *vita Ciceronis* as one of the chief sources of Plutarch.<sup>2</sup> And yet, an unprejudiced examination of the allusions in question is quite fatal to such an inference. In the first instance (c. 41), Tiro is cited in a merely parenthetical sort of way in defense of Cicero's conduct and the motives which led to the divorce from Terentia and to his subsequent marriage with his wealthy young ward. The account, which takes up an entire page, is distinctly unfavorable to Cicero, his own reasons

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.* 17.

<sup>2</sup> Heeren, Lagus, Sibinga, Peter, Graux, and others unhesitatingly assign all passages of a strictly biographical or personal nature to this source.

being regarded as at best plausible pretexts which his subsequent conduct stamped as such. The severe criticism of Antony, moreover, ἐν ταῖς πρὸς τοὺς Φιλιππικοὺς ἀναγραφαῖς, as well as similar references in later writers,<sup>3</sup> show that we are here face to face with a chapter taken from the contemporary *chronique scandaleuse*, which some author, fond of gossip and conversant with the criticisms and explanations put forth on both sides, impartially welded together. That this was not done by Plutarch will not be seriously denied, nor can any contemporary biographer, such as Tiro, be responsible for so objective a *résumé*. The whole passage, in fact, not only has a suspicious post-Augustan look, but is quite in the manner of Suetonius.

The pathetic story of Cicero's proscription and assassination, told at length and in a most graphic manner in c. 46-49, contains, at its close, the other allusion to Tiro's biography. After relating the inhuman treatment of Cicero's body at the hands of Pomponia, and how she compelled Philologus, his alleged betrayer (c. 48), to eat of his flesh, Plutarch, habitually unable to reject a story, however incredible, so long as it points a suitable moral, tells us (as if to relieve his conscience for having accepted what ἔνιοι τῶν συγγραφέων ἱστορήκασιν) that Tiro nowhere even so much as mentions this Philologus whose treacherous conduct forms an integral part of the preceding narrative. But if so, then Tiro cannot have been Plutarch's source for the closing period of Cicero's life. The grewsome character of the tale itself, the moral which it is made to point, and the very reference to ἔνιοι συγγραφεῖς, would alone show that contemporary authorities are out of question; for such apocryphal anecdotes could not arise until the real facts concerning Cicero had become obscured by time and thus brought

<sup>3</sup> Quint. VI. 3, 75, obiurgantibus quod sexagenarius Publiliam virginem duxisset; Dio Cass. XLVI. 18, 3, τίς δ' οὐκ οἶδεν ὅτι τὴν μὲν γυναῖκα τὴν προτέραν τὴν τεκοῦσαν σοι δύο τέκνα ἐξέβαλες, ἐτέραν δὲ ἐπείσηγάγον πάρθενον, ὑπεργήρως ὦν, ἵνα ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας αὐτῆς τὰ δανείσματα ἀποτίσῃς;



within the pale of the idealizing imagination, until a kind of legendary halo had formed about the historical individual. And, as a matter of fact, we know that the death of the great orator appealed powerfully to the sympathetic fancy of subsequent generations. But if the post-Augustan origin of the chapters under notice is thus established on general grounds, the correctness of this view may be concretely demonstrated by the following observation. In one of the *Controversiae* of Seneca, the title of which is given in full above (p. 6<sup>8</sup>), no fewer than sixteen rhetoricians are introduced who, each in his own way, discuss the ingratitude of one Popillius who, though acquitted of the charge of parricide through the efforts of Cicero, thereafter became the murderer of his benefactor. In the midst of this recital, Seneca inserts the following significant statement: *Popillium pauci ex historicis tradiderunt interfectorem Ciceronis et hi quoque non parricidii reum a Cicerone defensum sed in privato iudicio:⁴ declamatoribus placuit parricidii reum fuisse*. This passage, of course, admits of but one interpretation, to wit, that the connection of Popillius with the death of Cicero is unhistorical, being an invention of rhetoricians which was subsequently improved upon for epideictic purposes by making the alleged assassin a former client of Cicero in a *murder* trial, this circumstance naturally enhancing the pathetic features of his base ingratitude. Now when we read in Plut. *Cic.* c. 48, that among the assassins of Cicero there was one *Popillius ὁ πατροκτονίας ποτὲ δίκην φεύγοντι συνείπεν ὁ Κικέρων*, it will be at once manifest that the authority here followed had already abandoned the sober, unembellished facts of history in favor of the presumably more popular fiction of later *declamatores*, and Plutarch is so completely under its spell that he did not, as in the case of the Philologus incident, virtually stamp the story as apocryphal by the half-frank, half-naïve avowal that earlier, contemporary writers, such as

⁴ This is indirectly confirmed by Sen. *Suas.* VI. See the following note.

Tiro, had failed to record it. And yet the apparently insignificant circumstance that in this very narrative it is not Popillius, as we should expect, but Herennius who after pursuing and overtaking Cicero deals the fatal blow, has still preserved an unmistakable trace of the genuine account in which Popillius either played only a subordinate rôle or, what is more likely, did not figure at all.<sup>5</sup>

Finally, we cannot but recognize the handiwork of these same rhetoricians in the suicidal deliberations<sup>6</sup> which Cicero is alleged to have indulged in on reaching Astyra in his flight. *Κἀκεῖ διενυκτέρευσεν ἐπὶ δεινῶν καὶ ἀπόρων λογισμῶν, ὥστε καὶ παρελθεῖν εἰς τὴν Καίσαρος οἰκίαν διανοήθη κρύφα καὶ σφάξας ἑαυτὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἐστίας ἀλάστορα προσβαλεῖν*, a passage which bears a most suspicious family likeness to the *suasoriae* of the *Deliberat Cicero* type.<sup>7</sup>

IX<sup>b</sup>. But if Plutarch was independent of Tiro in the very chapters in which the latter is expressly quoted, any one of

<sup>5</sup> It is also worthy of notice that neither the *historians* quoted by Sen. *Suas.* VI (and both Livy and Asinius are among them), nor the sources of Appian and Dio Cassius, seem to be acquainted with the parricide version. Cp. Appian *B. C.* IV. 20, ὁ δὲ Λαῖνας (so always in his account) καὶ δίκην τινὰ διὰ τοῦ Κικέρωνός ποτε κατωρθώκως etc., and Dio XLVII. 11, 1, Ἀρετῆς μὲν δὴ καὶ εὐσεβείας τοσαῦτα τότε ἐπιφανῆ ἔργα ἐγένετο. Ποπίλιος δὲ δὴ Λαῖνας τὸν Κικέρωνα τὸν Μάρκον ἀπέκτεινε καίπερ εὐεργέτην αὐτοῦ ἐκ συνηγορήματος δυντα. The opening sentence, the quite gratuitous addition of τὸν Μάρκον, as well as the illustrations which follow, clearly point to a collection à la Valerius Maximus as the ultimate source of Dio. The narrative in Val. Max. V. 3, 4, however, appears to be based upon Livy, for just as Livy ap. Sen. l.c. declared, in cuius (sc. Ciceronis) laudes persequendas Cicerone laudatore opus fuerit, so Valerius maintains that only another Cicero could adequately deplore the sad end of the orator; but he too seems as yet ignorant of the later story, unless the words, C. Popillium Laenatem defendit, eumque saluum ad penates suos remisit, and the frigid antithesis, se caput ferre quod pro capite eius quondam peroraverat, must needs be interpreted as covert allusions to a murder trial.

<sup>6</sup> Cp. Ps. Cic. *ad Octavianum*, a rhetorical exercise of an early date: una cum istis vitam simul fugere decrevi.

<sup>7</sup> Cp. above p. 6<sup>8</sup> and esp. the perfectly analogous conception underlying the advice given in Sen. *Suas.* VII. 3, fac moriendo Antonium nocentiorē; 8, sine durare post te . . . perpetuam Antonii proscriptionem.

the following criteria will justify us in still further eliminating his *vita Ciceronis* in numerous other passages of the Greek biography, where scholars have nevertheless on general principles, it would seem, postulated an extensive indebtedness to it.

Tiro, we contend, must be rejected as a direct source of Plutarch: (1) Wherever recorded items of information are distinctly *unfavorable* to Cicero; and, if such occur within an otherwise homogeneous narrative, it will follow as a necessary corollary that the *entire* chapter is equally non-Tironian. (2) All paragraphs of importance which clearly *contradict*, or are *inconsistent* with, the extant utterances of Cicero cannot possibly have emanated from the editor of his correspondence and speeches. (3) All details which manifestly betray, for one reason or another, a *non-contemporary* or *post-Augustan* origin, must naturally have been wanting in Tiro's *vita Ciceronis*.

Now in applying these principles to the work under investigation I must again emphasize the necessity of keeping steadfastly in mind that Plutarch cannot, on psychological grounds alone, have accumulated his biographical information by consulting one particular authority, only to abandon it at the next moment, then reverting to it in the succeeding paragraph, and so on with kaleidoscopic variation.<sup>1</sup>

The very first chapter furnishes a number of variants concerning Cicero's father (οὐδὲν ἦν πυνθέσθαι μέτριον — οἱ μὲν — οἱ δὲ) which are mutually exclusive, one being unquestionably slanderous. Again, the reason given for the retention of the cognomen on the part of the first Cicero, and the refusal of his famous descendant to discard it in spite of the solicitation of his friends, absurdly imply that the Romans habitually regarded this appellative in the light of an opprobrious nickname. Plutarch's explanation must, therefore, have originated at a later time, when these cognomina had attracted

<sup>1</sup> See above pp. 4. 21.



the attention of philologists,<sup>2</sup> particularly as the alleged connotation of the term is due to a false etymology.<sup>3</sup>

Chapter 2. The prediction of Cicero's future greatness, though clearly a *vaticinium ex eventu*, may have been recorded by Tiro as well as the detailed account of his career at school. The statement, however, that he was taken μέσον αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τιμῇ casts some doubts upon this assumption, for a similar story is told by Nepos of Atticus, Cicero's fellow pupil.<sup>4</sup> In any case, Tiro cannot have been Plutarch's authority for the ἐρρῆ πῶς προθυμότερον ἐπὶ ποιητικῇν and for the estimate of Cicero's poetic productions. This paragraph, as well as the passage in c. 40, τῇ δὲ πρὸς τὴν ποίησιν εὐκολία παίζων ἐχρῆτο. Λέγεται γὰρ, ὀπηνίκα ῥυεῖν πρὸς τὸ τοιοῦτον, τῆς νυκτὸς ἔπη ποιεῖν πεντακόσια, is unquestionably post-Augustan,<sup>5</sup> and in all probability the entire narrative was taken directly from Suetonius's *vita Ciceronis*.

Chapters 3-5, which are closely connected, deal with the life of the young Cicero up to the time of his quaestorship. They contain the following indisputable evidence of non-Tironian origin, although they are habitually attributed to this source. Not to lay stress upon the fact that Plutarch does not seem to have known that Cicero associated himself with both Mucii, the augur and the pontifex, the statement that he subsequently served under Sulla in the Marsian War is notoriously false, for according to Cicero himself<sup>6</sup> he served under the consul Pompeius Strabo.<sup>7</sup> Again, we learn that

<sup>2</sup> Cp. esp. Plut. *Coriol.* 11; *Public.* 11; *Fab. Max.* 1. On the Roman use of cognomina designating bodily defects, cp. Hor. *Sat.* I. 3, 48 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. Plin. *Nat. Hist.* XVIII. 10, 3, iam Fabiorum, Lentulorum, Ciceronum ut quisque aliquod optime genus sereret.

<sup>4</sup> Nep. *Att.* 1. This seems to have been a usual mark of honor. Cf. Plut. *Cat. Min.* 57; Ovid *Fast.* V. 67.

<sup>5</sup> Cp. *Transact.* pp. 148-150.

<sup>6</sup> Phil. XII. 11, 27.

<sup>7</sup> Perhaps we may recognize in this error a deliberate attempt to bring the two great men into synchronistic association, Pompeius Strabo being too obscure and unimportant a figure. To cite only Roman analogies, cp. the

immediately on leaving school Cicero Φίλωνος ἤκουσε, whereas his first teacher was Phaedrus,<sup>8</sup> Philo not reaching Rome till after the death of Mucius, if the augur be meant. The account of the Roscian trial, to which we shall have occasion to refer again, is also full of errors which Tiro could not have committed.

Chapter 4, on the philosophical and rhetorical studies of Cicero, has been analyzed above (p. 17); and the same considerations which proved Plutarch not to have been indebted to the *Brutus* apply with equal force to Tiro's biography.

Chapter 5 is no less replete with errors and contradictions. That Tiro was well acquainted with the *de divinatione*, which contains a violent attack upon the Delphic oracle,<sup>9</sup> goes without saying; but if so, it is difficult to understand how he could have spoken of Cicero's visit to the shrine and of the answer of the priestess recorded by Plutarch. Following the advice of Apollo to keep aloof from politics, Cicero, we are told, lived in retirement for a while, his scholarly seclusion earning for him the nicknames of Greekling and pedant. This is also demonstrably erroneous, as Cicero *immediately* on his return from Asia (77 B.C.) applied himself assiduously to forensic pleading,<sup>10</sup> being elected unanimously to the quaestorship the year following. Surely an invention so palpably apocryphal — the chronological contradictions may well be attributed to Plutarch's notorious negligence in such matters — cannot have emanated from so trustworthy a source as Tiro.

The anecdote of the impassioned acting of Aesopus, the alleged teacher of Cicero, is an irrelevant addition, its

story of Sulla and the young Caesar (Suet. *Caes.* 1), of Accius and Pacuvius, Caecilius and Terence. If so, all early contemporaneous authorities would here be excluded as possible sources for Plutarch's statement.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Cic. *ad fam.* XIII. 1, 2, magis Phaedrus nobis cum pueri essemus, antequam Philonem cognovimus, ut philosophus . . . probabatur.

<sup>9</sup> II. 56, 115.

<sup>10</sup> *Brut.* 92, 318, Unum igitur annum cum rediissemus ex Asia, causas nobiles egimus cum quaesturam nos . . . peteret; *ad Att.* IV. 16<sup>a</sup>, 1.

digressional character being plainly indicated by *ἱστοροῦσιν*. That the story was still unknown to Cicero may be shown by a passage in the *Tuscul. Disput.*<sup>11</sup>

Finally, the remark at the end of the chapter, that Cicero by his excessive use of raillery and repartee *πολλοὺς ἐλύπει καὶ κακοηθείας ἐλάμβανε δόξαν*, will certainly not be attributed to the author who carefully collected the *dicta Ciceronis*.<sup>12</sup>

Chapters 6-9, which bring the narrative down to the consulship of Cicero, are perhaps the most incoherent in the entire biography, being made up of anecdotes, witticisms, personal characteristics, and historical items, some of which are open to serious objections. In at least two instances a *post-Augustan* origin must be assumed, and in another we unexpectedly come upon a statement highly derogatory to the orator, although these chapters are otherwise extremely eulogistic.

After relating the story of Cicero's quaestorship, which culminates in the anecdote discussed above, Plutarch speaks of his hero's efforts to win popularity and then suddenly tells us of his moderate means, adding that people marveled at his not accepting legal fees. Now the *lex Cincia de donis et muneribus*, which forbade this, had, indeed, become virtually a dead letter even in Cicero's time;<sup>13</sup> but it does not seem likely that any contemporary writers would have expressed their astonishment that the orator had failed to violate an existing statute. This was, however, entirely natural after the time of Claudius, who repealed the old law and substituted

<sup>11</sup> IV. 25, 55, *oratorem vero irasci minime decet . . . num egisse umquam iratum Aesopum?*

<sup>12</sup> Cp. also c. 27, τὸ δ' οἷς ἔτυχε προσκρούειν ἕνεκα τοῦ γελοίου πολλὸν συνήγγε μῦθος αὐτῷ 28 init., ἐκ τούτων ἐγένετο πολλοῖς ἐπαχθῆς *Comp. Dem. et Cic.* I, πολλαχού τῳ σκωπτικῷ πρὸς τὸ βωμολόχον ἐκφερόμενος etc.

<sup>13</sup> Cp. the interesting passage in *Verr.* I. 13, 37, where Cicero deploras the fact that so salutary a measure was falling into desuetude and severely arraigns Hortensius and others for its open violation. It was again enforced by Augustus. Cf. *Dio* LIV. 18 and *Ovid Am.* I. 10, 39, *turpe reos empti miseros defendere lingua*.



definite fees, the maximum being fixed at 10,000 sesterces.<sup>14</sup> The remark of Plutarch, as may be observed in passing, also proves that he did not consult the speeches against Verres, a fact confirmed by the conflicting statements regarding the 'litis aestimatio,'<sup>15</sup> the extremely low figure (750,000 sesterces) given by Plutarch being taken from some writer unfriendly to Cicero, as shown by the words which follow : διαβολὴν ἔσχεν, ὥς ἐπ' ἀργυρίῳ τὸ τίμημα καθυφειμένος, an accusation all the more remarkable as he repeatedly emphasizes the scrupulous honesty of Cicero in these very paragraphs and elsewhere, e.g. c. 36, *Comp. Dem. et Cic.* 3. The statement concerning the orator's precarious health is contradicted by Plutarch himself (c. 4) and by Asinius Pollio.<sup>16</sup> Again, the purchase of three villas and a house on the Palatine cannot, of course, be reconciled with the remark touching his modest means above referred to, but seems in some way directly associated with the bribery charge immediately preceding. The confusion and misrepresentation here pointed out would be unaccountable had Plutarch in these chapters been following Tiro or any other contemporary biographer. This inference is still further confirmed by the observation that Cicero did not buy the house on the Palatine until after his consulship,<sup>17</sup> and above all by the use of ἐν Ἀρπείοις, for which we should certainly expect ἐν Ἀρπίνιοις, as *Arpi* is a town of Apulia, where Cicero possessed no estate. All editors, from Xylander to Graux, accordingly agree that Plutarch here blundered. They strangely, however, overlooked the following passage in Martial, IV. 55, 3,

Luci, gloria temporum tuorum  
 Qui Gaium veterem Tagumque nostrum  
*Arpis* cedere non sinis *disertis*,

<sup>14</sup> Tac. *Ann.* XI. 6 f.

<sup>15</sup> Cp. Sibinga l.c. p. 37.

<sup>16</sup> ap. Sen. *Suas.* VI. 24 ad senectutem prospera permansit valetudo, but Dio Cass. XXXVIII. 16 says exactly the opposite : τὰ γὰρ πολλὰ ἡρρώσκει !

<sup>17</sup> *ad fam.* V. 6, 2 ; *ad Att.* I. 16, 10.

an unmistakable allusion to Cicero. That the poet here committed the very same error,<sup>18</sup> is quite incredible. The only plausible explanation of this coincidence is to assume that *Arpi* was an abbreviated form of *Arpinum* in use in Domitian's time or possibly earlier, but it is quite unlikely that Plutarch found it in any Augustan or pre-Augustan author.

The *ninth* chapter exemplifies by means of three illustrations the rigid integrity of Cicero as praetor. That these were not taken from a continuous narrative, such as Tiro's, but rather represent "clippings," is indicated by the introductory λέγεται, and by the virtually identical phrases at the beginning and the end of the Licinius anecdote,<sup>19</sup> which have all the appearance of labels for collectanea or chapter headings in a commonplace book. This origin seems further strengthened by the observation that the description of Οὐατίνιος as χοιράδων δὲ τὸν τράχηλον περιπλέως again occurs in c. 26: Βατίνιον ἔχοντα χοιράδας ἐν τῷ τραχήλῳ, as if he had been here mentioned for the first time. That the two anecdotes in this chapter, the nineteen examples of wit and repartee which take up c. 25 and 26, and the batch of satirical sayings collected in c. 38 ultimately go back to one and the same source,<sup>20</sup> such as the collections of Tiro or Trebonius, is generally believed; but that Plutarch had himself consulted these is highly improbable,<sup>21</sup> as he might have taken them

<sup>18</sup> e.g. Friedländer ad loc.: "Arpis aus Versehen statt Arpinum, Cicero's Geburtsort, genannt"! Other editors also fail to cite the Greek parallel.

<sup>19</sup> τὰς κρίσεις ἔδοξε καθαρῶς καὶ καλῶς βραβεῦσαι — τὸ δὲ πρᾶγμα τῷ Κικέρωνι δόξαν ἦνεγκεν ὡς ἐπιμελῶς βραβεύσαντι τὸ δικαστήριον.

<sup>20</sup> This seems clear from such phrases as γράψω δὲ καὶ τούτων ὀλίγα (c. 27) and βέλτιον δὲ καὶ τούτων ὀλίγα παραθέσθαι.

<sup>21</sup> Cp. Leo l.c. p. 164: Die c. 24–27 kennzeichnen sich selbst deutlich als eine Einlage in den Zusammenhang der Erzählung. . . . Es liegt nahe anzunehmen, dass der Stoff der Einlage aus Tiro's de iocis Ciceronis stamme, aber nicht wahrscheinlich ist es, dass Plutarch selbst ihn daher entnommen hat. Die ἀποφθέγματα gehörten in die Biographie eines als witzig bekannten Mannes; Cicero's dicta brauchte man anderthalb Jahrhunderte nach seinem Tode wahrlich nicht an der Quelle suchen. Cp. note to text § 53<sup>1</sup>.

more conveniently from Suetonius<sup>22</sup> or from one of the numerous compilations of ἀποφθέγματα existing in his time.

Cicero's conduct in the Manilian affair,<sup>23</sup> with which the chapter closes, is related only in Plutarch and Dio (XXXVI. 44). According to Plutarch, Manilius was accused, in the praetorship of Cicero, περὶ κλοπῆς.<sup>24</sup> If this corresponds to *furtum* or *peculatus*, the case would not have come under Cicero's jurisdiction at all, but under that of his colleague, C. Orchivius, Cicero having charge of matters *de pecuniis repetundis*.<sup>25</sup> But even if the Greek could mean the latter, the difficulty would still not be removed, for Manilius had not at that time been the governor of a province. Again, when Plutarch says that in this alleged trial, περὶ κλοπῆς, there was considerable opposition to Manilius on the part of the nobility, we have an evident confusion with the *lex Maniliana*, so well known to us through Cicero's extant speech *pro imperio Cn. Pompei*. This preceded the defense of Manilius, here spoken of, which was not undertaken until after his term of office had expired. It is impossible, therefore, that Plutarch was indebted for this paragraph to an early and trustworthy authority.

The narrative of the Catilinian Conspiracy (c. 10-23) has, owing to the numerous extant accounts of this same episode, engaged the special attention of scholars who, though differing in details, have yet come to the unanimous conclusion that Plutarch here, if anywhere, drank deeply of the original fountains, making extensive use of Sallust and of Cicero's orations, his Greek Memoir, and the *de consiliis suis*. We have shown

<sup>22</sup> To no Roman writer known to us is the σπεῖρειν ὅλῳ τῷ θυλάκῳ in the matter of *bons mots* so applicable as it is to him.

<sup>23</sup> Sibinga l.c. p. 43 f. discusses the subject, but his conclusions are quite erroneous.

<sup>24</sup> Dio l.c. does not state the nature of the charge (δίκης τέ τινος) and places it *after* the praetorship, Cicero *Cornel.* fragm. 1 agrees as to the date with Plutarch, while Ascon. Ped. *pro Corn.* p. 59, in a mutilated passage, says the charge was *de vi*.

<sup>25</sup> Cp. *pro Rab. Posth.* 4, 9; *pro Cluent.* 53, 147 quid C. Orchivii *peculatus*, quid mea *de pecuniis repetundis*?



that these assumptions are erroneous and that the entire story is not a mere mosaic of isolated facts pieced together capriciously from many sources, but is a consistent and coherent narrative, in spite of some unimportant chronological divergences, such as the enumeration of the Ciceronian speeches preceding the Catilinian,<sup>26</sup> and one undoubted *ἔμβλημα* which gives a fanciful explanation of Sura, the cognomen of Lentulus (c. 17).

But if so, the question at once arises, whether Tiro may not have been Plutarch's *fons primarius*, at least for this strictly *historical* portion.

That his narrative was based upon a *Latin* authority may perhaps be inferred from the occurrence of an evident Latinism in c. 14 which seems to have escaped observation. It is the phrase τοὺς πραγμάτων καινῶν ἐφιεμένους, which is exactly equivalent to the idiom *novarum rerum cupidus* or *rebus novis studere*. The expression is exceedingly common in Greek, but it seems to be always used with the *comparative*.<sup>27</sup> The only way to escape from the conclusion to which this remarkable departure from a well-established usage leads would be the assumption that the Latinism might have occurred in Cicero's

<sup>26</sup> The "orationes consulares," according to Cic. *ad Att.* II. 1, 3, followed in this order: Two speeches *de lege agraria*, *de Othone*, *pro Rabirio*, *de proscriptorum filiis*. Plutarch merely omits the fourth, and puts the last of these in first place. As they all belong in one year, the error is not very serious. Again, when Cicero in 63 B.C. defended Otho's *lex theatralis*, its author may well have been praetor (c. 13), although the law was passed in his tribuneship, in 67 B.C. The fact, however, that he is called *Marcus*, which was the praenomen of the emperor, instead of *Lucius*, if not a slip of the pen on the part of Plutarch himself, would certainly point to a source later than the reign of Nero.

<sup>27</sup> e.g. Herod. VII. 6 νεωτέρων ἔργων ἐπιθυμητής Xen. *Hell.* V. 2, 9 νεωτέρων ἐπιθυμοῦντες πραγμάτων, and similarly νεωτερίζειν. The only exceptions which I have been able to find, in spite of a long and diligent search, occur in Dio Cass. XXXVII. 50, curiously enough also in the account of the Catilinian conspiracy: καινῶν ἀεὶ ποτε πραγμάτων ἐπιθυμητάς, and in Plut. *Ant.* 9 νέων πραγμάτων ὀρεγόμενος, but both these passages were undoubtedly based upon Latin authors and the former, in particular, is not surprising in an author who exhibits so many Latinisms as Dio Cassius.

ὑπόμνημα τῆς ὑπατείας, but this solution of the difficulty must be rejected on the strength of the following passage in Cic. *ad. Att.* I. 19, 10: *commentarium consulatus mei Graece compositum misi ad te, in quo, si quid erit quod homini Attico minus Graecum eruditumque videatur, non dico quod tibi . . . Lucullus de suis historiis dixerat, se quo facilius illas probaret Romani hominis esse idcirco barbara quaedam et σόλοικα dispersisse. Apud me si quid erit eiusmodi me imprudente erit et invito.* It is not likely that the man whose cognomen was *Atticus* would have allowed the *σόλοικον* in question to pass unnoticed.

The numerous differences between the Greek narrative and Cicero's speeches, and the distinctly derogatory remark in c. 19 already discussed, are, in my judgment, as incompatible with the assumption of direct indebtedness to Tiro's biography as we found them irreconcilable with a first-hand knowledge of Cicero's writings bearing upon this subject.

The 24th chapter, which constitutes a sort of sequel to the preceding story, leading up to the long string of Ciceronian *facitiae* collected in c. 25-28, is perhaps the most instructive ἐμβλημα in the entire biography, for in no other chapter is there such an ostentatious array of authorities, and yet nowhere is the second-hand character of the information more easily demonstrable.

Plutarch begins by saying that Cicero's excessive self-laudation and the exaggerated estimate which he, with nauseating reiteration, placed upon the achievements of his consulship<sup>28</sup> disgusted many and exposed him to attack. The fact is notorious and has found epigrammatic expression in Seneca.<sup>29</sup> But that the effect here attributed to Cicero's self-praise, however repugnant it may have seemed to some later

<sup>28</sup> Cp. also the still more emphatic censure of this failing in *Comp. Dem. et Cic.* c. 2.

<sup>29</sup> *de brev. vitae* 5, 1, quotiens illum ipsum consulatum suum non sine causa sed sine fine laudatum detestatur. Dio Cass. XXXVIII. 12 expatiates on the subject with his usual anti-Ciceronian bias.

Romans, reflects any actual contemporary feeling, must be seriously questioned, in view of the entire lack of a modest self-restraint which the ancients habitually exhibit when speaking of their own achievements.

Nay more, the very phrase which follows: τὰ βιβλία τελευτῶν κατέπλησε καὶ τὰ συγγράμματα seems to me to reveal a *later* source, in that the juxtaposition of the two substantives would be intolerably tautological, unless we assume that the collocation was occasioned by the *post-Augustan* use of *liber* in the sense of *oratio*,<sup>30</sup> συγγράμματα<sup>31</sup> appropriately designating the other *scripta* of Cicero. And, as a matter of fact, we find that of the numerous illustrations of Cicero's readiness to praise not only himself but others as well, which Plutarch introduces by the words ὡς ἐκ τῶν συγγραμμάτων λαβεῖν ἔστι, not one, so far as we can still make out, occurs in an *oration*. The phrase itself, of course, no more proves that Plutarch had himself laboriously selected all these examples from the works of Cicero<sup>32</sup> than the statement of Tac. *Germ.* 5, *est videre apud illos argentea vasa*, points to the author's personal presence in Germany.

The same conclusion must be drawn from the confident and sweeping statements contained in the succeeding words of this same chapter: τῶν δὲ μεγάλων καὶ θαυμαστῶν ἐπαίνων οἷς πολλαχοῦ<sup>33</sup> χρήται περὶ τοῦ ἀνδρός and again τῶν δὲ κατ' αὐτὸν ἐνδόξων . . . οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδεὶς, ὃν οὐκ ἐποίησεν ἐνδοξότερον ἢ λέγων ἢ γράφων εὐμενῶς περὶ ἐκάστου. For if we were to accept the first on Plutarch's own responsibility, it would

<sup>30</sup> Cp. my note to Tac. *Dial.* 3 (p. 70) and Landwehr in *Archiv f. lat. Lexic.* VII pp. 223-235.

<sup>31</sup> It is the very term which Cicero himself used for his essays and dialogues. Cp. *ad Att.* XVI. 6, 4, ex eo (sc. volumine prooemiorum) eligere soleo, cum aliquod σύγγραμμα institui.

<sup>32</sup> The words immediately following πολλὰ δ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπομνημονεύουσιν (sc. οἱ περὶ Κικέρωνος γράψαντες) may, indeed, have been intentionally inserted here to forestall such an inference, for they are not necessary to the context.

<sup>33</sup> Some *twenty* eulogistic references to Demosthenes occur in Cicero's extant writings, and they are widely scattered at that.



involve an absolutely exhaustive knowledge of the *opera omnia* of Cicero, such as but few Romans could ever have boasted of, while the latter assertion would at the same time imply a most profound acquaintance with the posthumous reputation of the individuals in question, such as the Greek biographer certainly did not possess. Nevertheless scholars have had no scruples in attributing all these items concerning Plato, Aristotle, Theophrastus, and Demosthenes, as well as the information based upon the letters to Herodes, Gorgias, Pelops, and the young Cicero, to Plutarch's perusal of the original passages, though some are not averse to accepting an intermediary source, such as Tiro, as a possible contingency. But that Plutarch was indebted for this learned digression to some *later* authority — the chapter reminds us of Suetonius at every turn — is made evident by the allusion to certain pedantic critics of Cicero,<sup>34</sup> who took him to task for a disparaging remark concerning Demosthenes, found in his Letters, probably in one addressed to Calvus.<sup>35</sup> Plutarch refutes these *obtrectatores Ciceronis* by reminding them that they forget to cite or intentionally ignore the *μεγάλοι καὶ θαυμαστοὶ ἔπαινοι οἷς πολλαχοῦ χρῆται περὶ τοῦ ἀνδρός*. Unless all signs fail, we possess in this defense a faint echo of the literary controversies of later scholars, of which Aper's attack upon Cicero in the Tacitean Dialogus may furnish an illustration. This seems to me at least to be a more reasonable supposition than to assume that Tiro had taken occasion to free

<sup>34</sup> Such as Didymus e.g., against whose attack upon Cicero, it will be remembered, Suetonius a hundred years later wrote a separate treatise. Cp. also Tac. *Dial.* c. 12 plures hodie invenies qui Ciceronis gloriam . . . detrectent and my notes ad loc. (p. 153).

<sup>35</sup> The reference seems to be to the lost correspondence of Cicero with Calvus and Brutus, cited by Quintilian and Tac. *Dial.* 18, 21 f., where see my note p. 204. That the letter was addressed to Calvus I am inclined to infer from the vagueness of the allusion *πρὸς τινα τῶν ἐταίρων ἔθηκεν ἐν ἐπιστολῇ γράψας*, for if it had been written to the "well-known" Brutus, his biographer would probably have said so, as in c. 43. Calvus's name occurs nowhere in Plutarch and was presumably unknown to him.

his hero of a charge, in reality too trivial and unjust to be dignified by serious refutation.

Having already discussed the sources of c. 25-27, we may now turn to what may be called the Clodian Episode, in c. 28-35. It is the other long and continuous narrative which, together with the account of the Catilinian Conspiracy, takes up one half of the entire biography. Here, as there, our sources of information are unusually full and varied, for, besides the works of Cicero, Appian<sup>36</sup> and, above all, Dio Cassius<sup>37</sup> have devoted considerable space to the narrative of these stirring times. To them we should add the more or less incidental discussions and references in Asconius Pedianus, Plutarch's *Cato Min.*, *Crassus*, *Pompey*, *Caesar*, and Suetonius's *Life of Caesar*, not to mention other more scattered allusions. Finally, of accounts now no longer extant, those of Tiro and Livy were probably the most valuable and exhaustive.

Plutarch's narrative, though full of details, is, with few exceptions to be noted presently, in remarkable agreement not only with the testimony of Cicero, but also with that of Dio, who, in the story of the Clodian episode, on the whole exhibits a sympathetic attitude toward the orator, in striking contrast with the almost Mommsenian hostility displayed toward him elsewhere in his history. This circumstance finds its only plausible explanation in the assumption that he did not hate Cicero less but Clodius more, and hence did not hesitate to base his account upon a writer who, though kindly disposed toward Cicero, appealed to him because of the exhaustive character of his treatment. Now Plutarch's account is no less eulogistic, and, in at least one instance, relating to Cicero's timid conduct in the Milonian affair (c. 35), clearly apologetic. This attitude, taken in connection

<sup>36</sup> *Bell. Civ.* II. 14-16. 20-22.

<sup>37</sup> XXXVII. 45 f. 51; XXXVIII. 10-17. 48-30 (Philiscus's speech to console the exiled Cicero); XXXIX. 6-11 (the return of Cicero). 13-24 (Clodiana); XL. 44-57 (Clodius and Milo).

with the unflattering rôle assigned to Terentia in c. 29 and 30, naturally suggests the probability that here at all events Tiro's biography was closely followed by Plutarch; for even the one unqualified censure which he directs against the unmanly conduct of Cicero in exile (c. 32) would not militate against this assumption, inasmuch as the author of the *Parallel Lives* may have designedly inserted so well-deserved a criticism,<sup>38</sup> in order to point the contrast with the laudable demeanor of Demosthenes under similar circumstances.<sup>39</sup> But the abundant evidence already adduced of Plutarch's independence of Tiro in cases where we should expect him to have been consulted above others, and the undoubtedly unhistorical statement that Terentia's jealousy, caused by her husband's alleged relations with the notorious Clodia, eventually led Cicero by way of exculpation to make an enemy of her equally profligate brother, a story which a Suetonius, we may be sure, would have seized upon with avidity — these considerations, I maintain, render Plutarch's indebtedness to Tiro for the Clodian episode far less plausible than it might seem on superficial analysis. But if any concrete confirmation of this view be thought necessary, it will be found in certain items dealing with Cicero's exile which either contradict the explicit testimony of Cicero or are objectionable on other grounds; for I regard it as self-evident that Tiro could not have erred in matters of detail with which he must have been as familiar as his patron.

Thus, we read in Plut. c. 32 that Cicero was forbidden to take shelter *ἐντὸς μιλίων*<sup>40</sup> *πεντακοσίων Ἰταλίας*, whereas we

<sup>38</sup> Certain curious resemblances between Plutarch and Dio may show that while the *consolatio* of Philiscus is undoubtedly a rhetorical composition of Dio himself, many of its ideas were not of his own invention.

<sup>39</sup> Cp. also *Comp. Dem. et Cic.* 4.

<sup>40</sup> An evident Latinism, as may be observed in passing. Dio Cass. XXXVIII. 17, 6 practically agrees with Plutarch, when he says *τρισχίλους τε γὰρ καὶ ἑπτακοσίους καὶ πεντήκοντα σταδίους ὑπὲρ τὴν Ῥώμην ὑπερῶρισθη* (= *ultra CCCCLXVIII millia passuum Roma exulare iussus est*).



learn from Cic. *ad Att.* III. 4, in *qua* (sc. rogatione) *erat eiusmodi ut mihi ultra quadringenta milia liceret esse*. Again the statement ἐν δ' Ἰππωνίῳ, πόλει τῆς Λευκανίας, ἣν Οὐιβῶνα νῦν καλοῦσιν, Οὐίβιος, Σικελὸς ἀνὴρ, who had been greatly benefited by Cicero, οἰκία μὲν οὐκ ἐδέξατο, when compared with *ad Att.* l.c. a *Vibone . . . subito discessimus . . . statim iter Brundisium contuli . . . ne et Sicca, apud quem eram, periret*, reveal an amazing confusion which cannot be accounted for satisfactorily, if Tiro was Plutarch's source, for the two passages unquestionably relate to the same incident. In the first place, Vibo is a town of Bruttium, not of Lucania, and it was so called in Cicero's day. An individual Vibius, a Sicilian, nowhere occurs in Cicero's works; on the other hand, *Sicca*, an old friend, had an estate at Vibo, and he received the exile kindly. Finally, it were passing curious, if one Vibius had lived in a town Vibo which, according to Plutarch's explicit albeit demonstrably erroneous information, had not at the time in question borne that name! In all likelihood this Sicilian owes his existence to *Vibo* or one of its inflected forms being taken for the name of an individual. The description of Cicero's departure from Brundisium, his landing at Dyrrhachium, the portents which followed, their interpretation by οἱ μαντικοί, whose opportune presence is as miraculous as the *σημεῖα* themselves, — all these items not only constitute, as the λέγεται indeed foreshadows, an ἔμβλημα of different origin from the preceding, but, what is still more important, none of them are found in Cicero's itinerary as given in his Correspondence.

The brief paragraph which follows (c. 36) deals with Cicero's proconsulship in Cilicia. It is written in a tone of panegyric, and with the exception of two statements, one of which is significantly introduced by λέγεται, substantially coincides with the extant utterances of Cicero, the closing sentence making, indeed, the impression of a direct paraphrase

from one of his letters.<sup>41</sup> Still, as this was written from Rome Jan. 4, 49, after Cicero had been on Italian soil again since Nov. 24, 50, it is incredible that Plutarch had capriciously selected a brief note to Tiro merely to borrow a metaphor, while he overlooked the earlier and more important letters to Atticus (e.g. VII. 4. 5), in which the writer with equal confidence predicts the Civil War. But if the second- or third-hand character of Plutarch's information needed any further confirmation, it would be furnished by the immediately preceding allusion to Cicero's facetious reply to the request of Caelius to send him some panthers; for not only does the answer not strictly coincide with the Latin original,<sup>42</sup> but, what is far more significant, the orator's well known correspondent is styled *Caecilius*,<sup>43</sup> an amusing blunder which Plutarch cannot, of course, have found either in Cicero's letters or in Tiro, their editor.

The brevity and incidental character of the narrative of the Civil War, from its beginning to the proscription of Cicero (c. 37-47), was naturally due to the fact that throughout this period Cicero, with the memorable exception of the last year of his life, was condemned to complete political inactivity or played but a subordinate rôle, Pompey, Caesar, Brutus, Antony, and finally Octavianus occupying simultaneously or successively the center of the historical stage. The

<sup>41</sup> εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἐπανῆλθεν, ἥδη τῶν πραγμάτων ὥσπερ ὑπὸ φλεγμονῆς ἀφισταμένων ἐπὶ τὸν ἐμφύλιον πόλεμον = *ad fam.* XVI. 11, 2 (addressed to Tiro): ego ad urbem accessi . . . sed incidi in ipsam flammam civilis discordiae vel potius belli.

<sup>42</sup> Cp. γράφει πρὸς αὐτὸν οὐκ εἶναι παρδάλεις ἐν Κιλικίᾳ, πεφευγέναι γὰρ εἰς Κάριαν ἀγανακτούσας, οἷ μόναι πολεμοῦνται, πάντων εἰρήνην ἐχόντων and *Cic. ad fam.* II. 11, 2, de pantheris . . . agitur mandatu meo diligenter, sed *mira paucitas est et eas quae sunt*, valde aiunt queri quod nihil cuiquam insidiarum in mea provincia nisi sibi fiat; itaque constituisse dicuntur in Cariam ex nostra provincia decedere, sed tamen sedulo fit et in primis a Patisco.

<sup>43</sup> That Κεκίλου is not here, as occasionally elsewhere, e.g. *Comp. Dem. et Cic.* c. 1, 14, a mere slip of the pen for Κελίου or Καίλου, is made evident by the addition τοῦ ῥήτορος which clearly identifies him with the famous critic, a younger contemporary of Cicero.

fascinating story of the death struggle of the Republic was told by many illustrious writers whose material, after passing through various channels, found its way into Plutarch's *Lives* of the protagonists. Only the biographers of Cicero would, therefore, have had any motive or occasion to pay particular attention to his part in the conflict which preceded the assassination of Caesar. Accordingly the chapters under notice are chiefly devoted to the *man* Cicero, to his personal traits and domestic affairs, only so much of the history of the times being given as was essential to an adequate understanding of his conduct. Hence also the anecdotal and digressive character of these paragraphs, one entire chapter (c. 38) being taken up, as we have seen, with the witticisms of Cicero in Pompey's camp,<sup>44</sup> favorable<sup>45</sup> and unfavorable<sup>46</sup> criticisms standing amicably side by side. Some of these items are not found elsewhere in extant sources, a comparatively late origin being, moreover, highly probable in most of them.

Thus the pleasant story (c. 40) — it is introduced by λέγεται — of the effect of Cicero's eloquence upon Caesar in the case of Ligarius, told with circumstantiality of detail and in Plutarch's best style, is undoubtedly a later embellishment, as may be seen from a comparison with Cicero's own account;<sup>47</sup> for if Caesar's deep emotion had actually manifested itself in the manner related by Plutarch, the orator would hardly have confessed his inability to describe it. In the Greek, Caesar

<sup>44</sup> Cp. Cic. *Phil.* II. 16, 39 ne de iocis quidem respondebo quibus me in castris usum esse dixisti etc.

<sup>45</sup> e.g. c. 39, 22 ff.; 45, 26 ff.

<sup>46</sup> e.g. c. 38, 32 f.; 39, 1 ff.; 41, 1 ff.; 42, 8 ff.; 43, 4 ff.; 45, 14 ff. 12 ff.; 46, 17 ff.

<sup>47</sup> *ad fam.* VI. 14, 2 (to Ligarius): non solum ex oratione Caesaris quae sane mollis et liberalis fuit, sed etiam ex oculis et vultu, ex multis praeterea signis quae facilius perspicere potui quam scribere, hac opinione discessi, ut mihi tua salus dubia non esset. It is hard for us moderns, who read the *pro Ligario* in cold print, to realize the emotional effect which it is said to have produced, for that it was a much admired oration is also confirmed by Cic. *ad Att.* XIII. 12, 2. 19, 2.



had fully made up his mind in advance to condemn Ligarius at all hazards, in the Latin speech he is represented as having been amenable to the pleas of mercy from the start.<sup>48</sup> Again, when Plutarch says τέλος δὲ τῶν κατὰ Φάρσαλον ἀψαμένου τοῦ ῥήτορος ἀγώνων ἐκπαθῇ γενόμενον τιναχθῆναι τῷ σώματι etc., neither he nor the author of the story can have had the extant speech before them, for the only direct allusion to the battle (which, at least to modern feeling, does not even rise to any great heights of pathos) occurs at the beginning rather than at the end!<sup>49</sup> Finally, τὸν γοῦν ἄνθρωπον ἀπέλυσε τῆς αἰτίας βεβιασμένος, unless interpreted as an acquittal on the spot, would spoil the effect of the anecdote; and yet, according to Cicero, Caesar reserved his decision, though the advocate left the court room convinced of the ultimate triumph of his client.

The determination of the sources in the closing chapters, which briefly touch upon events of the Civil War, does not fall within the scope of this investigation, as it involves the far larger question concerning the authorities which Plutarch followed in his Lives of Caesar, Pompey, Antony, Brutus, and Cato Minor.

The patient reader who has followed my analysis so far will, I hope, have carried away the conviction that all the evidence is strongly against the universal assumption of Plutarch's direct indebtedness to the numerous authorities belonging to the Ciceronian or early Augustan period; that, in other words, neither the works of Cicero nor the Catiline of Sallust nor the biography of Tiro nor the history of Livy, to mention only the most important, furnished him, at first hand, with any of the material accumulated in his life of the orator. But the foregoing examination has at the same time

<sup>48</sup> Cp. also *ad fam.* VI. 13, 2 (to Ligarius): non fore in te Caesarem duriorē, nam et res eum cotidie et dies et opinio hominum et, ut mihi videtur, etiam sua natura mitiorem facit.

<sup>49</sup> In § 9, there being 37 in all.

given abundant *positive* proofs that numerous details must, for one reason or another, be assigned to a *post-Augustan* origin, a contingency which Sibinga had timidly suggested in one or two instances, while Leo and Schwartz both seem to imply that the authors whom they postulate as Plutarch's principal source belonged to the same period.

X<sup>a</sup>. But however strong the foundation may be upon which, as I believe I have shown, the above conclusion is based, we cannot as yet rest satisfied with it. We must still inquire, whether it be not also possible to give to this post-Augustan authority of Plutarch "a local habitation and a name."

If we carefully survey the passages in question, his characteristics will combine into the following picture: He was a scholar of exceptional erudition who had an exhaustive first-hand knowledge of the entire literature on his subject, who, though a warm admirer of Cicero, was impartial and objective enough not to exclude such unfavorable criticisms of his hero as he met with in his sources. He was extremely fond of anecdotes, scandalous gossip, and 'bons mots,' a firm believer in dreams and prodigies as premonitions of the future. Not over punctilious in matters chronological nor imbued with a desire to distinguish with scrupulous care the true and the false, he did not weigh the validity of conflicting evidence, everything being grist that came to his mill. Of a philological turn of mind, he had a predilection for certain details and loved to dwell upon the literary manifestations and intellectual characteristics of the individuals whose careers he had set himself to describe. Finally, he must have lived sufficiently far removed in time from Cicero to account on the one hand for the accidental discoloration of many incidents in the orator's life and for the erroneous interpretation of many facts, the usual result of a dimmed historical perspective, and, on the other, to allow for the ivy-growth of biographical fiction, the inevitable penalty which great men pay to posterity for the boon of immortality.

Now there is unquestionably no known scholar of the imperial age who so perfectly fulfills all the above conditions, none whose method of work, no less than the character of whose information, would be more likely to have attracted the author who professed to write *Lives* not *Histories*, than *Suetonius Tranquillus*. And if we further add that he not only wrote a defense of the orator against an attack of Didymus,<sup>1</sup> but also a *Life of Cicero*, the conclusion, that many of the items in Plutarch which have been shown to be post-Augustan were taken directly from this work of his contemporary, will acquire a very high degree of probability. It will become all but certain, however, if we finally succeed in establishing this indebtedness, so far inferred on internal grounds alone, on the basis of a number of passages in other Latin authors indubitably taken from the Suetonian biography.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Amm. Marcell. XXII. 16, 16, Chalcenterus Didymus . . . qui in illis sex libris ubi nonnumquam imperfecte [locutum] Tullium reprehendit, sillographos imitatus scriptores maledicos, iudicio doctarum aurium incusatur ut immania frementem leonem putidulis vocibus canis catulus longius circumlans; and *Suidas* s. v. Τραγκύλλος: περὶ τῆς Κικέρωνος πολιτείας βιβλίον[4]. ἀντιλέγει δὲ Διδύμῳ. See also the discussion in Macé, *Essai sur Suetone* pp. 284-287.

<sup>2</sup> See my paper in the *Transact.*, esp. pp. 151-158. Its results have been accepted by Christ, *Griech. Literat.*<sup>3</sup> p. 652 note 1; 653, note 7, and Macé, *Essai sur Suetone* p. 244. 411. Other scholars who have had occasion to touch upon the sources of Plutarch's *Cicero* have ignored the article. Willrich l.c. p. 36-38, though he devotes a chapter to Suetonius, remains, in consequence, in blissful ignorance of the true state of affairs, as do Leo and Schwartz (ll. cc.). Their conclusions, however, deserve quotation on other grounds. The former (p. 165) says: "Die Biographie ist einheitlich gearbeitet, von einem Manne angelegt der Tiro und wenigstens einen anderen Biographen Cicero's, Cicero's Memoiren und Briefe und, ausser anderem, historische Gewährsmänner heranzog und seinen Standpunkt zwar auf der Cicero freundlichen Seite nahm, aber die Gegner zu Wort kommen liess und selbst tadelte. *Plutarch war es gewiss nicht, nennen können wir ihn nicht*," and Schwartz p. 602: "Der plutarchische Gewährsmann war kein Politiker und kein Historiker grossen Stils, es war ein sehr belesener Pedant, der keine Lesefrucht umkommen liess und aus Gutem und Schlechem, aus Sallust und Cicero, sowie aus der Pamphlet- und Klatschlitteratur ein buntes Mosaik zusammenfügte, das bald werthvolles Detail, bald gleichgiltigen Kleinkram, bald giftiges Gerede zu einem seltsamen Bilde vereinigte." My own characterization above, though independently drawn



I refer, in particular, to the items on Roman Literature in *St. Jerome's* additions to the Chronicle of Eusebius and to the anonymous treatise *de viris illustribus*, usually printed with the *Caesares* of *S. Aurelius Victor* and attributed in the majority of MSS. to Pliny the Younger, while the scholars of the Renaissance, chiefly it would seem misled by the title, identified it with its famous namesake.<sup>3</sup> St. Jerome's obligations to Suetonius are universally admitted, but it does not appear to have been noticed that, whatever the other sources of the *de viris illustribus* may have been,<sup>4</sup> its eighty-first chapter at all events, which deals with the life of Cicero, was also drawn from the same fountain, though, like the rest of the treatise, it has come down to us only in a horribly epitomized form. I base this conviction not so much upon the identity of the titles or even upon the circumstance that Suetonius's *de viris illustribus* no less than his *Caesares* were demonstrably pillaged by later historians who had occasion to treat of the same topics,<sup>5</sup> but rather upon the numerous coincidences existing between the anonymous writer and admittedly Suetonian fragments,<sup>6</sup> in particular those passages

up, agrees in all essential particulars with the two sketches just cited. I was, therefore, all the more surprised to find that *Suetonius* had not sat for the portrait so well painted by the two Göttingen scholars. Suetonius had, indeed, drunk deeply from pure historical fountains, but at the same time he would cast his dragnet far into the murky and polluted waters of tradition, and its rich haul was no less palatable to him. Cp. also, Peck, *Suetonius' Lives of Caesar and Augustus*, New York 1889, p. x: He can only accumulate with patient industry a vast number of details. Nothing is too unpleasant, nothing too personal to be left unrecorded. He pins a scandal and adds it to his collection, as a naturalist would a butterfly, but at the same time he does not dwell upon these matters.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. Macé l.c. p. 344.

<sup>4</sup> H. Peter, *Die geschichtl. Literat.* etc. II. pp. 367-372. In spite of what has been written on the subject, the identity of the author of the unepitomized original and Aurelius Victor, the author of the *Caesares*, is a by no means improbable contingency. The indebtedness of Victor to the *Caesares* of Suetonius is well established. Cp. Peter l.c. II. 356 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Macé l.c. p. 401-420; Peter l.c. II. 35.

<sup>6</sup> E.g. *de vir. ill.* 2 = Suet. p. 318, 4 Rf.; *id.* 3, 2 = *id.* p. 319, 2; *id.* 5, 1 = *id.* p. 320, 5.

concerning Cicero which the Anonymus and St. Jerome have in common.

X<sup>b</sup>. Remembering then that both these writers were alike indebted to Suetonius's *de viris illustribus*, we may now turn to c. 3 of Plutarch's biography, a paragraph, be it observed, so perfectly coherent, that it must needs have been taken in its entirety from one and the same source.

Now this passage contains at least *two errors*. The one consists in the implication that the *pro Roscio Amerino* was the earliest speech of Cicero, whereas it is known that he made his oratorical début with the *pro Quinctio* in 81 B.C., in the 26th year of his age, the former belonging to the next year.<sup>1</sup> As St. Jerome gives the correct date, it might be argued that Plutarch did not here follow Suetonius; but this inference is neutralized by the *second* error, to the effect that Cicero after the Roscian trial left for Greece *fearing the anger of Sulla*, though he alleged ill health as the cause for his sudden departure. This statement flatly contradicts the facts of history, for so far from leaving Rome out of any dread of the dictator the young orator remained in the city for nearly two years more, delivering in the meantime at least two speeches, one for L. Varenus and another in behalf of a

<sup>1</sup> That Plutarch did not purposely ignore the *pro Quinctio*, as relating only to a *causa privata*, is made clear by the fact that the very same error, as Gellius *N. A.* XV. 28, 1 informs us on the authority of Asconius Pedianus, was shared by Cornelius Nepos and Fenestella: in librorum primo quos de vita illius (sc. Ciceronis) composuit (sc. Nepos) errasse videtur cum eum scripsit tres et viginti annos natum primum iudicii publici egisse Sextumque Roscium . . . defendisse. In qua re etiam Fenestellam errasse Pedianus Asconius animadvertit quod eum scripserit sexto vicesimo aetatis anno pro Sextio Roscio dixisse. Longior autem Nepotis quam Fenestellae error est nisi quis vult in animum inducere Nepotem studio amoris et amicitiae adductum amplificandae admirationis gratiae quadriennium suppressisse ut M. Cicero orationem florentissimam dixisse pro Roscio admodum adulescens videretur. Cicero himself makes no distinction between the two *causae*, where he speaks of his first oratorical efforts. Cp. in *Verr.* II. 2, 65, 159, tum primum nos ad causas et privatas et publicas adire coepimus.

woman of Arretium.<sup>2</sup> It must be perfectly clear that such a calumny, or, if you will, misunderstanding, cannot well have arisen until post-Augustan times; and when I add that there are but *two* authors, besides Plutarch, who are guilty of the same misstatement, namely *Hieronimus* and the *Anonymus*,<sup>3</sup> the conclusion that all three are equally indebted to Suetonius's *vita Ciceronis* will be irresistibly forced upon us,<sup>4</sup> the more so as palpable errors shared in common often furnish a safer clue to interdependence than coincidences in matters of fact.

Plutarch's remarks concerning Cicero's father in c. 1, as the οὐδὲν ἦν πυνθέσθαι μέτριον and the οἱ μὲν—οἱ δέ indicate, must have been based upon an author who was wont to collect such traditions, leaving the reader to select what suited his fancy; on the other hand, the calumny involved in ἐν κναφείῳ τινὶ καὶ γενέσθαι καὶ τραφῆναι τὸν ἄνδρα excludes contemporary biographers and historians.<sup>5</sup> The whole passage has,

<sup>2</sup> Cp. esp. *ad Att.* I. 19, 4 Arretinos quorum agrum Sulla publicarat neque dividerat, in sua possessione retinebam; *pro Caec.* 33, 97, (de eadem causa) atque hoc et contra dicente Cotta et *Sulla vivo* iudicatum est; *Brut.* 91, 314, sed cum censerem remissione et moderatione vocis et commutato genere dicendi me et periculum vitare posse et temperatius dicere, ut consuetudinem dicendi mutarem, ea causa mihi in *Asiam* proficiscendi fuit. Itaque cum essem *biennium* versatus in causis et iam in foro celebratum meum nomen esset, Roma sum profectus.

<sup>3</sup> Hieronymus: Roscio contra Chrysogonum defenso Cicero Athenas secessit et inde post triennium Romam regreditur; *de viris illust.* 81: Adolescens Rosciano iudicio eloquentiam et libertatem suam adversus Sullanos ostendit ex quo veritus invidiam Athenas studiorum gratia petivit. It will be also noticed that all three authors speak of *Athens* or *Greece* (εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα) as Cicero's immediate destination, whereas he expressly says that it was *Asia*.

<sup>4</sup> That no injustice is done to Suetonius by ascribing to him a slanderous statement of this nature is made evident by Suet. *Iul.* 4, composita seditione civili, Cornelium Dolabellam . . . repetundarum postulavit; absolutoque *Rhodium* secedere statuit et *ad declinandam invidiam* et ut per otium et requiem Apollonio Moloni clarissimo tunc dicendi magistro operam daret (cp. Plut. c. 4 and above p. 17). All the circumstances here afford an admirable parallel to the passage of Plutarch, and the motive given for Caesar's departure is as similar as it is unquestionably false.

<sup>5</sup> The same reproach is made by Calenus ap. Dio Cass. XLVI. 4, but this rhetorical invective could at best be only an echo of some contemporary



in fact, the true *color Suetonianus*; and that this impression is not purely subjective is again shown by two passages in Hieronymus and the Anonymus<sup>6</sup> concerning Cicero's alleged royal descent, the statement being also found in Plutarch, but nowhere else in extant sources,<sup>7</sup> while the name of the orator's mother and that of *Herennius* as one of the murderers of Cicero<sup>8</sup> are preserved only in St. Jerome and Plutarch.

We have already seen that c. 4 could not have been taken from an early authority and it was intimated that Suetonius may well be made responsible for it. This hypothesis will be rendered all but certain by the following consideration. At the close of the chapter, Plutarch relates that Apollonius (Molo), after listening in sullen silence to a Greek oration which Cicero had delivered amid the applause of his fellow pupils, finally, instead of also praising the effort, cried out that he pitied the fate of Greece, in that culture and eloquence, the only glory which still remained to her, would now also be transferred to Rome.<sup>9</sup> This anecdote is nowhere even alluded to by Cicero;<sup>10</sup> there is, indeed, but one other reference to it

slander which did not in any case reach Plutarch directly from such remote and early sources.

<sup>6</sup> *Hieronymus*: M. Tullius Cicero Arpini nascitur Helvia, patre equestri ordinis ex regio Volscorum genere; *de vir. ill.* 81: M. Tullius genere Arpinas patre equite Romano natus genus a Tullo Attio rege duxit.

<sup>7</sup> Unless, indeed, we except *Sil. Ital. Pun.* VIII. 406, Regia progenies et Tullo sanguis ab alto; XII. 175, Clarum Volscorum Tulli decus. Its origin may be due to a jesting remark of Cicero, *Tusc.* I. 16, 38, Pherecydes Syrius . . . antiquus sane; fuit enim meo regnante gentili. Cp. *Brut.* 16, 62, ut si ego me a M'. Tullio esse dicerem qui patricius cum Servio Sulpicio consul anno X post exactos reges fuit.

<sup>8</sup> In view of the numerous extant accounts, this is a very significant parallelism.

<sup>9</sup> A similar story is told of John Reuchlin and his teacher Argyropolus. Cf. Raumer, *Gesch. der Paedag.* I. 65.

<sup>10</sup> That it was, in fact, unknown to him appears from *Brut.* 91, 316: ibi me ad . . . Molonem applicavi . . . in notandis animadvertendisque vitiis . . . prudentissimum. Is dedit operam (si modo id consequi potuit) ut nimis redundantes nos et superfluentes . . . reprimeret et quasi extra ripas diffluentes coecerneret.

in extant sources, and curiously it is found in none other than in the *vita* of the Anonymus, who mentions it, moreover, in precisely the same connection, for after speaking of Cicero's studies at Athens (cited above) he continues as follows: *Inde eloquentiae gratia Asiam, post Rhodum petiit, ubi Molo-nem . . . magistrum habuit qui flesse dicitur quod per hunc Graecia eloquentiae laude privaretur.* In view of the interdependence between the Anonymus, Plutarch, and Suetonius already established, this parallelism must be regarded as adding but another link in the chain of evidence for Plutarch's direct indebtedness to Suetonius's *vita Ciceronis*.<sup>11</sup>

Plutarch's statement (c. 46, λέγεται) concerning the alleged reluctance of Octavian to sacrifice Cicero leads to the same conclusion. This transparent fiction, designed by apologists to clear the founder of the empire of one of the darkest stains in his entire career, is first met with in a famous passage of Velleius,<sup>12</sup> though it doubtless did not originate with him. Thereafter, excepting Plutarch, I have been able to find but *two* passages which imply a knowledge of this apology, for, strange as it may seem, neither Appian nor Dio make any allusion to it.<sup>13</sup> The one occurs in our anonymous *vita: cum triumviros se fecissent Caesar, Lepidus Antoniusque concordia*

<sup>11</sup> An incidental remark in Suet. *de rhet.* 1, Cicero ad praeturae usque etiam Graece declamavit, Latine vero senior quoque et quidem cum consulibus Hirtio et Pansa, may show that he was not likely to have neglected a discussion of Cicero's rhetorical studies in his biography.

<sup>12</sup> II. 66, 1, repugnante Caesare sed frustra adversus duos, instauratum Sullani exempli malum, proscriptio. Nihil tam indignum illo tempore fuit quam quod aut Caesar aliquem proscribere coactus est aut ab ullo Cicero proscriptus est etc.

<sup>13</sup> Unless App. *B. C.* IV. 51, ἐς ἀπολογία τῆς Κικέρωνος ἐκδόσεως . . . ὕπατον (sc. ἀπέφηνε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Κικέρωνος) be so construed. Their silence may either have been due to their well-known hostility to Cicero which blinded them to the reprehensibility of Octavian's conduct, or, what seems more probable, their sources were still ignorant of this particular attempt to whitewash the emperor. Livy's famous comment can, of course, be interpreted only as a quasi justification of Antony. Cp. Liv. ap. Sen. *Suas.* VI. 22, quae (sc. mors Ciceronis) vere aestimanti minus indigna videri potuit quod a victore inimico (sc. Antonio) nil crudelius passus est quam quod eiusdem fortunae compoti fecisset.

*non aliter visa est inter eos iungi posse nisi Tullius necaretur*, the other in — Suetonius *Aug.* 27, *in quo* (sc. triumvirato) *restitit quidem aliquamdiu collegis ne qua fieret proscriptio sed inceptam utroque acerbius exercuit*. The latter statement is thereupon substantiated by numerous illustrations, whereas the tradition of Augustus's previous reluctance is allowed to stand by itself. This circumstance would be most plausibly explained by the assumption that Suetonius had already discussed it elsewhere; but this was most appropriately done in his narrative of the death of Cicero, the most noted victim of the proscription.

In the light of these passages, pointing as they all do in one and the same direction, another fact which a comparison between Plutarch and the anonymous *vita* reveals now at once assumes a peculiar significance. The latter contains *thirty-six* items of information. Of these *all* are met with in the Greek narrative,<sup>14</sup> and, with two exceptions, in the *identical chronological order*.<sup>15</sup> As an isolated observation, this coincidence

<sup>14</sup> See Appendix II.

<sup>15</sup> Quaestor — Aedilis — Praetor *Ciliciam* *latrociniiis* liberavit — Consul. If the italicized sentence were sound, *praetor* would be absurd and the chronological sequence of events, otherwise strictly observed throughout, rudely destroyed. Two solutions of the difficulty suggest themselves. (a) Some words like *fuit eodem tempore quo Pompeius* dropped out after *praetor*, the temporal coincidence being sufficiently close (67, 66) to have caused the two to be mentioned together, particularly as Cicero's praetorship was not marked by any conspicuous achievement. (b) The allusion is to Cicero's *proconsulship* in Cilicia, in 51 B.C. This is rendered probable, because otherwise all reference to his victorious campaign would be wanting. It is also not without significance that Plutarch and the Latin *vita* would here again *alone coincide*, in that both speak of Cicero's *iusta victoria* as a defeat of a *band of robbers*. If so, the words *Ciliciam* etc. may have been accidentally omitted, then placed in the margin, opposite *Siciliam*, owing to its graphical similarity to *Ciliciam*. Subsequently they intruded into the text in the wrong place, causing a conflation of two passages, but the resulting blunder was not noticed, because the retention of *praetor* did not disturb the regular sequence of the *cursus honorum*. Whether the confusion was due to a later scribe or to the epitomator, whose condensation of the original has here, in fact, been so merciless as to leave little more than bald chapter-headings, I do not venture to determine. — The other disagreement



would possess no argumentative validity whatever ; but when it is taken in connection with the preceding discussion, the inference that the anonymous *vita* and Plutarch's biography were alike based upon Suetonius will appear not merely plausible, but unavoidable and convincing.

X<sup>c</sup>. So far we were compelled to invoke the aid of authors under demonstrable obligations to Suetonius to prove Plutarch's indebtedness to him. In the following passage an extant utterance of Suetonius himself will, I hope, enable us to reach the same goal, although the road to it is a long one and obstructed with difficulties. I refer to the *Dream of Cicero*, related at length and with picturesque details by Plutarch in c. 44. It is a digression, abundantly marked as such by an ἐδόκει, a ὥς ἔοικε, and a φασί in two places. While Pompey and Caesar were still alive, the orator dreamed that the sons of senators had been summoned to the Capitoline hill, Jupiter intending to choose from out their number the future ruler of Rome. They all passed in review before him, whereupon he selected one boy and, taking him by the right hand, said : "This one, O Romans, as your ruler will put an end to the Civil Wars." Going down to the Campus Martius next day, among some boys at exercise Cicero's eyes fell first of all upon the very lad whom he had beheld in his dream. Amazed at this, he inquired about the boy's parents and learned that he was the son of one Octavius, a man not of noble descent, and of Attia, and that Julius Caesar was his uncle. By a curious coincidence also he was born in the very year of Cicero's consulship.<sup>1</sup> These circumstances prompted him to

occurs in a digression in c. 20. Plutarch there says that Cicero at an early date suspected Caesar of monarchical designs ; the same prescience is attributed to him in the *vita*, but in connection with the Clodian episode. The only other extant writer to confirm this is — Suetonius (Caes. 14) who cites a letter of Cicero to that effect. See note to text (§ 46<sup>b</sup>).

<sup>1</sup> Suet. *Aug.* 94 and Dio Cass. XLV. 2, in placing the birth of Augustus not only in the same year, but on the very day and hour of the famous senate meeting which decided the fate of the conspirators, show that the synchronistic

pay assiduous court to the youth, and at a later period they were alleged as the reason, or rather the pretext, for Cicero's efforts to win the favor of Octavianus.

Now the question as to Plutarch's authority for this story, granting that it originally came from the living lips of Cicero and was not a transparent fiction *ex eventu*, might appear on first glance to be most satisfactorily answered by Tertull. *de anima* c. 46, M. Tullius Cicero civilium turbinum cultorem *de somnio*<sup>2</sup> narrat quod *in vitae illius commentariis conditum*, particularly as Plutarch expressly quotes these very Memoirs in one place<sup>3</sup> and evidently alludes to them in another passage<sup>4</sup> of his biography of Cicero. And yet, even if we were to admit, what is after all extremely doubtful,<sup>5</sup> that Plutarch himself perused the thirteen books *de vita sua*,<sup>6</sup> the statement that Octavian's father was τῶν οὐκ ἄγαν ἐπιφανῶν cannot well have been taken from this source, although the emperor did not, like some of his panegyric biographers, trace his descent back to Tarquinius Priscus.<sup>7</sup> The real difficulties

method, so dear to the ancients, had as yet lost little of its fatal fascination. Cp. Vell. Pat. II. 36, 1, consulatui Ciceronis non mediocre adiecit decus natus eo anno divus Augustus, and above p. 31<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. also Suet. *Aug.* 91 somnia neque sua neque *aliena de se* neglegebat.

<sup>3</sup> *Comp. Dem. et Cic.* 3, ὁ Καῖσαρ ἐν τοῖς πρὸς Ἀγρίππαν καὶ Μακρήναν ὑπομνήμασιν εἰρηκεν.

<sup>4</sup> *Cic.* 45 ὡμολόγει δὲ Καῖσαρ αὐτὸς ὡς . . . χρήσταιτο τῇ Κικέρωνος ἐν δέοντι φιλαρχίᾳ. Cp. also Plut. *Brut.* 27, 41; *Ant.* 20, ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν.

<sup>5</sup> Cp. H. Peter, *Die Biographien* etc. p. 136 f.

<sup>6</sup> Suet. *Aug.* 85, aliqua *de vita sua* quam tredecim libris, Cantabrico tenuis bello (27 B.C.) nec ultra exposuit.

<sup>7</sup> Suet. *Aug.* 2 f. Sed haec *alii* (Plut. *Cic.* 1, οἱ δὲ ἐς Τύλλον Ἀττιον ἀνάγουσιν): *ipse Augustus* nihil amplius quam equestri familia ortum *scribit* vetere ac locuplete et in qua primus senator pater suus fuerit (αὐτὸς γε μὴν Κικέρων etc.). *M. Antonius* libertinum ei proavum *exprobrat*, restionem e pago Thurino, avum argentarium (= οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐν κναφείῳ τινὶ καὶ γενέσθαι καὶ τραφῆναι τὸν ἄνδρα λέγουσιν). Nec quidquam ultra de paternis Augusti maioribus *repperi* (ταῦτα μὲν οὖν . . . ἰσθόρηται). C. Octavius pater a principio aetatis et re et existimatione magna fuit (ὁ μὲντοι πρῶτος ἐκ τοῦ γένους Κικέρων ἐπονομασθεὶς ἄξιος λόγου δοκεῖ γενέσθαι etc.) ut equidem *mirer* hunc quoque a *nonnullis* argentarium . . . *proditum*. I have cited this paragraph *in extenso* to show the remarkable

begin, however, when we examine the two other references to this incident, preserved in Suetonius and Dio Cassius. It will be necessary to cite them in full.

Suetonius *Aug.* 94: quoniam ad haec ventum est, non ab re fuerit subtexere quae ei prius quam nasceretur et ipso natali die ac deinceps evenerint, quibus *futura magnitudo eius* et perpetua felicitas sperari animadvertique posset.<sup>8</sup> . . . *Quo natus est die, cum de Catilinae coniuratione ageretur* in curia . . . vulgata res est P. Nigidium . . . affirmasse *dominum terrarum orbi natum*.<sup>9</sup> . . . *Q. Catulus* post dedicatum Capitolium *duabus continuis noctibus somniavit*: prima, Iovem Optimum Maximum e praetextatis compluribus circum aram ludentibus unum secrevisse atque in eius sinum rem publicam quam manu gestaret reposuisse; at insequenti animadvertisse se in gremio Capitolini Iovis eundem puerum, quem cum detrahi iussisset, prohibitum monitu dei, tamquam is ad tutelam rei publicae educaretur; ac die proximo obvium sibi Augustum, cum incognitum alias haberet non sine admiratione contuitus, simillimum dixit puero de quo somniasset. *Quidam prius somnium Catuli aliter exponunt*, quasi Iuppiter compluribus praetextatis tutorem a se poscentibus, unum ex eis demonstrasset ad quem omnia desideria sua referrent, eiusque osculum delibatum digitis ad os suum retulisset.

*M. Cicero* C. Caesarem in Capitolium prosecutus *somnium*

family likeness between it and the opening chapter of Plutarch, which has already been proved on independent grounds to have been based upon Suetonius's *vita Ciceronis*. Here, as in the case of Augustus, evidently *περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς οὐδὲν ἦν πυνθέσθαι μέτρον*. Cf. also Suet. *Vitell.* 1, Vitelliorum originem alii aliam et quidem diversissimam tradunt, partim veterem et nobilem, partim vero novam et obscuram atque etiam sordidam etc.; *Vesp.* 1.

<sup>8</sup> Suetonius never loses an opportunity to report such predictions. Cp. also Serv. *ad Aen.* VI. 799, Suetonius ait in vita Caesaris (in the now lost opening chapter) responsa esse data per totum orbem nasci invictum imperatorem, and Suet. *Vesp.* 5. The similar passage in Plut. *Cic.* 2, τῇ δὲ τίτθι φάσμα δοκεῖ γενέσθαι καὶ προειπεῖν ὡς ὄφελος μέγα πᾶσι Ῥωμαίοις ἐκτρεφούσῃ etc. has, therefore, like the rest of the paragraph, a strong Suetonian flavor.

<sup>9</sup> It will be observed that the birth of Octavian in the year of Cicero's consulship is in Plutarch referred to in close connection with the dream.



*pristinae noctis familiaribus forte narrabat: puerum facie liberali, demissum e caelo catena aurea, ad fores Capitolii constitisse eique Iovem flagellum tradidisse; deinde repente Augusto viso quem ignotum plerisque adhuc avunculus Caesar ad sacrificandum acciverat, affirmavit ipsum esse cuius imago secundum quietem sibi obversata sit.*

Dio Cass. XLV. 2 after relating four of the five 'prodigia' given by Suetonius, including the prediction of Nigidius, likewise continues with the story of the dreams:

Παιδίσκου τε αὐτοῦ ὄντος καὶ τὴν διατριβὴν ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ποιουμένου ἔδοξέ ποτε ὁ Κικέρων ὄναρ, ἀλύσεσί τε αὐτὸν χρυσαῖς ἐς τὸ Καπιτώλιον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καθιμῆσθαι καὶ μάστιγα παρὰ τοῦ Διὸς εἰληφέναι· καὶ (οὐ γὰρ ἡπίστατο ὅστις ἦν) περιέτυχέ τε αὐτῷ τῆς ὑστεραίας ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ Καπιτωλίῳ καὶ γνωρίσας αὐτὸν διηγῆσατο τοῖς παροῦσι τὴν ὄψιν. ὃ τε Κατοῦλος, οὐδ' αὐτός που ἑωρακὼς τὸν Ὀκταοῦιον, ἐνόμισε τοὺς παῖδας ἐν τοῖς ὕπνοις τοὺς εὐγενεῖς πάντας ἐν τῷ Καπιτωλίῳ πρόσδοον πρὸς τὸν Δία πεποιεῖσθαι καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τὸν θεὸν εἰκόνα τινὰ τῆς Ῥώμης ἐς τὸν ἐκείνου κόλπον ἐμβεβληκέαι. ἐκπλαγεὶς δὲ ἐπὶ τούτῳ, ἀνῆλθεν ἐς τὸ Καπιτώλιον προσευξόμενος τῷ θεῷ· καὶ ἐκεῖ τὸν Ὀκταοῦιον εὐρὼν ἄλλως ἀναβεβηκότα, τό τε εἶδος αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸ ἐνύπνιον προσήρμοσε καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν τῆς ὄψεως ἐβεβαιώσατο. He then proceeds, again precisely as in Suetonius,<sup>10</sup> μετὰ τοῦτο . . . τὴν τε ἐσθῆτα τὴν ἀνδρικὴν ἐνδύντος, ὁ χιτῶν περιερράγη τε ἐκατέρωθεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπωμίδων καὶ μέχρι τῶν ποδῶν κατερρύνῃ. τοῦτο αὐτὸ μὲν καθ' ἑαυτὸ οὐχ ὅπως τέκμαρσιν τινα, ὡς καὶ ἀγαθόν τι προσημαῖνον, ἔφερεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἠνίασε τοὺς παρόντας. . . . ἐπελθὼν δὲ τῷ Ὀκταοῦίῳ εἰπεῖν, ὅτι τὸ ἀξίωμα τὸ βουλευτικὸν πᾶν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας μου σχίσω . . . ἐξ οὖν τούτων ὁ Καῖσαρ μεγάλη ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἐλπίσας . . . ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἦσκει

<sup>10</sup> *Aug.* 94, Sumentis virilem togam tunica lati clavi, resuta ex utraque parte, ad pedes decedit. Fuerunt qui interpretarentur non aliud significare, quam ut is ordo cuius insigne id esset quandoque ei subiceretur. . . . Another miracle is related, and then: illo et praecipue ostento motum Caesarem ferunt, ne quem alium sibi succedere quam sororis nepotem vellet.

καὶ πάνθ' ὅσα προσήκει τῷ μέλλοντι καλῶς . . . τηλικούτον κράτος διοικήσειν ὑπάρχειν, ἀκριβῶς ἐξεπαίδευσε.

Dio, as is generally admitted, handles his borrowed material with considerable freedom, expanding or condensing to suit his purpose; accordingly we meet with some items in the above narrative which he could not have found in Suetonius, although the coincidences between them are otherwise remarkably close and numerous. Now, unless we are prepared to regard all the accretions in question as emanating from Dio himself, the resemblance just pointed out must be attributed to a *common third source*, such as the *Θεολογούμενα* of Asclepiades Mendes perhaps, whom Suetonius expressly cites as one of his authorities, for it cannot be denied that the story of the dream might also have found an appropriate place in such a work. The further inference, however, that Plutarch may be likewise indebted to this "*συναγωγὴ θαυμασίων*," since all direct obligations to Augustus's *ὑπομνήματα* are out of the question, must be rejected the moment we analyze the passages in Dio, Suetonius, and Plutarch a little more closely. In the first place, it must be noted that the account of the last named differs in essential particulars and in the very setting from the narrative of the others. Then again, Plutarch omits Catulus altogether, though some of the details of Cicero's dream are incorporated by Suetonius and Dio in the dream which they attribute to Catulus, Dio, moreover, to make matters worse, in his turn combining some features of both dreams.

Tertullian unfortunately fails to inform us how the orator's dream was related in the emperor's Memoirs,<sup>11</sup> nor can we gather from his silence that no mention at all was made of the similar experience of Catulus. Now, as Suetonius demonstrably made a most extensive use of Augustus's autobiography

<sup>11</sup> Perhaps Tertullian's reference to Augustus as the man destined to put an end to the civil wars, the very prediction in which the vision of Cicero culminates, may point to the Memoirs as the *ultimate* source of Plutarch; for in the other versions the civil wars do not figure at all.

and yet tells an essentially different story, two possible solutions suggest themselves. Either Plutarch, through an oversight or intentionally, substituted Cicero for Catulus who, if known to him at all, may have appeared too unimportant an individual for his purpose, or else Suetonius related the anecdote differently in his *Cicero* and in his *Augustus*. In the one, following some such authority as Asclepiades or Iulius Marathus,<sup>12</sup> he gave it as we read it in the extant biography; in the other, adopting the version of Augustus's own narrative, he told it as we find it in Plutarch. I believe that the latter alternative more accurately represents the actual state of affairs, a conviction confirmed by the remark of Suetonius l.c. *Quidam prius somnium Catuli aliter exponunt* etc. For, just as we here learn that Catulus was credited with two dreams on the same subject during successive nights, but that tradition varied as to the contents of the first, so we may plausibly conjecture that a dream which some attributed to Catulus was by others assigned to Cicero, and that the latter version had been accepted by Suetonius in his Life of Cicero and thus transmitted to Plutarch; the interval of time which separated the two Latin biographies, as well as the various sources consulted by Suetonius, being quite sufficient to account for the divergences in question.

X<sup>d</sup>. Having thus established Plutarch's indebtedness to Suetonius's *vita Ciceronis* with the aid of the Suetonian material still extant, we shall now be methodically justified in assigning to the same source those portions of Plutarch's biography for which in a majority of instances we were compelled on *internal* grounds to assume a *post-Augustan* origin, provided they at the same time clearly exhibit the well-known characteristics of Suetonius.

Now the items which completely satisfy the aforesaid conditions are above all those pertaining to the *personal* or strictly

<sup>12</sup> Cited by Suet. l.c. as one of his sources.



*biographical* traits of Cicero<sup>1</sup> for which, as we have seen, *Tiro* had hitherto, though on insufficient grounds or positively erroneous surmises, been regarded as the *fons primarius* of Plutarch. To be more specific, I maintain, and I hope the preceding discussion has justified the claim, that the following topics were taken by Plutarch directly from Suetonius's *vita Ciceronis*:

The information concerning the parentage, the name (c. 1), the birth and the early youth of Cicero, the statement about his poetic effusions (c. 2 and 40), the criticism passed upon them (c. 2), the entire contents of c. 5, the stray notes on Cicero's property (c. 5. 6) and on the state of his health (c. 8). Furthermore, the learned digression concerning Cicero's self-glorification and eulogy of others (c. 24), the alleged origin of his feud with Clodius (c. 27), the philological comment on Cicero's merits in enriching the Latin language by the coinage of philosophical terms (c. 40) and the remark on Cicero's design to write a Roman History (c. 41), the story of his matrimonial troubles (c. 41), and finally the narrative of his proscription and assassination (c. 46-49).

That the important events in the career of Cicero which in Plutarch are intimately associated with his *forensic* activity, such as the trial of Verres, the attack upon the agrarian legislation of Rullus, the affairs of Manilius and Milo, also received adequate treatment at the hands of Suetonius goes without saying. Now, as the Greek author in all these instances did not, as we have shown, draw from the original fountain, the inference, that he here too had recourse to the same authority whom he followed so extensively elsewhere, will not be rejected as intrinsically improbable.

<sup>1</sup> That a few of these may have reached Plutarch through oral channels or may represent the gleanings of his own casual reading, whether reproduced from memory or from his notebook, is all but certain (cp. e.g. c. 6. 49, 3 πυνθάρομαι etc.), especially in the case of anecdotal topics. But the material collected from such quarters could not have been sufficiently extensive to invalidate the above contention. See p. 4.

For the strictly *historical* events, in particular the Catilinian conspiracy, I am rather inclined to postulate some post-Augustan authority whose attitude was distinctly favorable to Cicero and who was in possession of all the contemporary sources on the subject, but who made no attempt to reconcile the manifold differences or traditions which had arisen in the lapse of time. The Clodian episode on the other hand, though also of one piece and hence not to be distributed among several sources, may well have been treated in Suetonius; at least, the story of the origin of the feud and the rôle assigned to Terentia (c. 29), as well as the account of the exile and the return of Cicero, are quite in his manner, not to mention that Plutarch quite fails to grasp the deeper political significance of events, but merely chronicles, again *more Suetoniano*, the bald facts.

On the basis of two passages of Aulus Gellius<sup>2</sup> and Servius,<sup>3</sup> Reifferscheid has with considerable ingenuity attempted to vindicate to Suetonius a work, entitled *Historia bellorum civilium*, which comprised the events from Pompey's defeat of the pirates (67 B.C.) to the battle of Actium (31 B.C.). This history, which, according to the same scholar, was also consulted by Dio Cassius and St. Jerome, would thus practically have included the entire career of Cicero, and as such might have been Plutarch's source for the historical portions just discussed, as well as for those relating to the Civil War proper (49-31), in which case Suetonius would have been relieved of the necessity of treating the same occurrences at length in his Life of Cicero. This enticing theory, however, stands and falls with the initial hypothesis of Reifferscheid. But, as he has unfortunately utterly failed to establish its

<sup>2</sup> *N. A.* XVI. 4, 4, Eundem Bassum Suetonius Tranquillus praepositum esse a M. Antonio . . . Parthos tribus ab eo proeliis fusos scribit, eumque primum omnium de Parthis triumphasse et, morte obita, publico funere sepultum esse.

<sup>3</sup> ad Verg. *Georg.* IV. 127, per transitum tangit *historiam a Suetonio memoratam*. Pompeius enim victis piratis Cilicibus partim ibidem, partim in Graecia, partim in Calabria agros dedit.

verisimilitude,<sup>4</sup> no inferences of any value can be drawn from it for the solution of the problem before us.

There is no reason to believe that Suetonius treated of these events at any greater length in his *Life of Cicero*, they being more or less incidental to it, than Plutarch felt called upon to do, particularly as historical narrative was not Suetonius's forte. There would, therefore, be no obstacle to the assumption that Plutarch here too was content to follow in the footsteps of the Roman biographer, were it not for the fact that the other *Lives* alluded to above (p. 41. 46) prove that he had secured and utilized an exhaustive account of the Civil Wars, it being unlikely that this was as yet unknown to him when he composed his *Cicero* which preceded them in time.<sup>5</sup>

But be this as it may, we shall at any rate be justified in contending on the strength of the foregoing analysis that Plutarch did not consult at first hand any of the works of Cicero or any pre-Augustan authorities, such as Sallust, Tiro, or Nepos, but that the *vita Ciceronis* of Suetonius constituted his *principal* source. In fact, I feel convinced that if the last named were extant we should discover that their interdependence was essentially similar to that which obtains between Plutarch's *Coriolanus* and the corresponding narrative of Dionysius, whom the biographer followed even in those cases where an ἐνίοι φασι would naturally suggest some other sources of information.

<sup>4</sup> The entire question has been fully dealt with by Macé, *Essai sur Suetone* pp. 346-354.

<sup>5</sup> On the chronological sequence of Plutarch's *Lives*, see Michaelis, *de ordine vitarum parall. Plutarchi*, Berlin 1875. The *vita Ciceronis* is later than that of *Sulla*; but as this, according to c. 21, cannot have been published before 115 A.D., we have a *terminus post quem* for the *Life of Cicero*. Now Plin. *Epist.* V. 10 (105 A.D.), as is generally admitted, alludes to the *de viris illustribus* of Suetonius, and asks him not to withhold them any longer from the public. There will, therefore, be no chronological difficulty in the way of Plutarch's indebtedness to this work, even if we agree with Macé l.c. p. 66-72 on so late a date as 113 A.D. for its appearance, particularly as all of its five parts were not necessarily issued together.





## APPENDIX I

### EXPLANATORY NOTE

The division of the Greek text into paragraphs and sub-paragraphs is designed to distinguish more clearly than is done by the traditional chapter-numbers the constituent parts into which the biography may be resolved.

The foot-notes do not aim to give an even adequately complete Source Commentary, but are chiefly intended to refute by an accumulation of examples the opinion now generally held, and discussed in the preceding pages, that Plutarch directly consulted the *works of Cicero* or any other contemporary authority, such as Sallust, for *biographical* purposes.

The more important passages are cited under two rubrics. Those under (A) designate substantial *agreement* with Plutarch, those under (D) *disagreement* in whole or in part.

All source-references in the text are spaced.

The text is that of Sintenis, with the following exceptions:

- c. 2, 5 S. *ἡμέρα*. . . *Καλανδῶν* exhibits a hopeless confusion, primarily caused by Plutarch's misreading *novas* for *nonas*. *Καλανδῶν* is probably an explanatory gloss due to a misunderstanding of *ante diem III. Nonas*, the month having been omitted. See c. 2 note 4. The soundness of the text can be vindicated only on the supposition that Pl. followed the Greek method of reckoning and that *novae Kalendae* was used for the Kalends of January, but for this I can find no evidence.
- c. 4, 17. *καὶ πολλή* is bracketed because the words contradict c. 3, 29, *ἡ φωνὴ πολλὴ μὲν καὶ ἀγαθή*. The double *πολλά* (ll. 18, 19) is probably responsible for the addition.
- c. 5, 23. The absurd *νοσήσας* has been changed to *νόησας*. See my note, *Class. Rev.* XIV (1900) p. 62.
- c. 7, 25. *Βέρρην γάρ*. . . *καλοῦσιν* clearly belongs after *ἔφη ὁ Κικέρων*.
- c. 23, 22. *ἐκείνων* with some MSS. for *ἐκείνου*, for the *ἐξουσία* of the *praetor* Caesar and the *tribune* Cato was not *ἴση*.
- c. 29, 16. I have introduced my emendation *διὰ Κατέλλου* for *διὰ Τύλλου*. Compare *Amer. Jour. of Phil.* XI pp. 316 ff.

*Συγκρ.* I, 4. I write *Καίλου* for *Κεκίλου*, but retain the latter reading, though equally erroneous, in c. 36, for the reasons given on p. 44.

My thanks are due to my friend and colleague Prof. Wm. N. Bates for his kindness in reading the proof of these pages.

Feb. 1902.

A. G.

## PLUTARCH'S LIFE OF CICERO

1. I. Κικέρωνος δὲ τὴν μὲν μητέρα<sup>1</sup> λέγουσιν Ἑλβίαν καὶ γεγονέναι καλῶς καὶ βεβιωκέναι. Περὶ δὲ τοῦ πατρὸς οὐδὲν ἦν πυθέσθαι μέτριον. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐν κναφεΐῳ<sup>2</sup> τινὶ καὶ γενέσθαι καὶ τραφῆναι τὸν ἄνδρα λέγουσιν, οἱ δ' εἰς Τύλλον Ἀπτιον ἀνάγουσι τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ γένους, βασιλεύσαντα λαμπρῶς ἐν Οὐολούσκοις<sup>3</sup> καὶ πολεμήσαντα Ῥωμαίοις οὐκ ἄδυνάτως.

2. Ὁ μέντοι πρῶτος ἐκ τοῦ γένους Κικέρων ἐπονομασθεὶς ἄξιος λόγου δοκεῖ γενέσθαι, διὸ τὴν ἐπικλησιν οὐκ ἀπέρριψαν οἱ μετ' αὐτόν, ἀλλ' ἡσπᾶσαντο, καίτερ ὑπὸ πολλῶν χλευαζομένην. Κίκερα γὰρ οἱ Λατίνοι τὸν ἐρέβινθον καλοῦσι, κᾰκέινος ἐν τῷ πέρατι τῆς ῥίνος διαστολὴν, ὡς εἰκεν, ἀμβλεῖαν εἶχεν, ὥσπερ ἐρεβύνθον διαφνὴν, ἀφ' ἧς ἐκτῆσατο τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν. Αὐτός γε μὴν Κικέρων, ὑπὲρ οὗ τάδε γέγραπται, τῶν φίλων αὐτὸν οἰομένων δεῖν, ὅτε πρῶτον ἀρχὴν μετῆι καὶ πολιτείας ἡπτετο, φυγεῖν τοῦτο καὶ μεταθέσθαι, λέγεται νεανειυσάμενος εἰπεῖν, ὡς ἀγωνιέται τὸν Κικέρωνα τῶν Σκαύρων καὶ τῶν Κάτλων ἐνδοξότερον ἀποδείξαι. Ταμιεύων δ' ἐν Σικελίᾳ καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς ἀνάθημα ποιούμενος ἀργυροῦν τὰ μὲν πρῶτα δύο τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐπέγραψε, τὸν τε Μάρκον καὶ τὸν Τύλλιον, ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ τρίτου σκώπτων ἐρέβινθον ἐκέλευσε παρὰ τὰ γράμματα τὸν τεχνίτην ἐντορεῦσαι. Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν περὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος ἱστοροῦνται.

Jan. 3.  
106 B.C.

3. II. Τεχθῆναι δὲ Κικέρωνα λέγουσιν ἀνωδύνως καὶ ἀπόνως λοχευθείσης αὐτοῦ τῆς μητρὸς ἡμέρᾳ τρίτῃ τῶν νέων Καλανδῶν†,<sup>4</sup> ἐν ᾗ νῦν οἱ ἄρχοντες εὐχονται καὶ θύουσιν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος.

Τῇ δὲ τίτθι φάσμα δοκεῖ γενέσθαι καὶ προειπεῖν ὡς ὄφελος μέγα πᾶσι Ῥωμαίοις ἐκτρεφούσῃ.

Ταῦτα δὲ ἄλλως ὀνειράτα καὶ φλύαρον εἶναι δοκοῦντα ταχέως αὐτὸς ἀπέδειξε μαντεῖαν ἀληθινὴν ἐν ἡλικίᾳ τοῦ μανθάνειν γενόμενος, δι' εὐφυνίαν ἐκλάμψας καὶ λαβὼν ὄνομα καὶ δόξαν ἐν τοῖς παισίν, ὥστε τοὺς πατέρας αὐτῶν ἐπιφροῦναι τοῖς διδασκαλείοις ὅψει τε βουλομένους ἰδεῖν τὸν Κικέρωνα καὶ τὴν ὑμνουμένην αὐτοῦ περὶ τὰς μαθήσεις ὀξύτητα καὶ σύνεσιν ἱστορῆσαι,

Passages quoted verbatim or discussed in the foregoing analysis are marked with an asterisk (\*).

<sup>1</sup> (A) \* Hieron. in *Euseb. Chron.* Olymp. 168, 3(2).

<sup>2</sup> (A) \* Calenus apud Dio Cass. XLVI. 4, 2, 5, 3.

<sup>3</sup> (A) \* Hieron. l.c.; *de vir. illustr.* 81 (Appendix II). (D) *pro Mur.* 8, 17.

<sup>4</sup> (D) Cic. *ad Att.* XIII. 42, 2, diem meum scis esse III. Nonas Ianuarias; VII. 5, 3, III. Nonas, natali meo; Gell. *N. A.* XV. 28, 3.



τοῖς δ' ἀγροκοτέροις ὀργίζεσθαι τοῖς νείειν ὀρώντας ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς τὸν Κικέρωνα μέσον αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τμῇ λαμβάνοντας.

4. Γενόμενος δ' ὥσπερ ὁ Πλάτων<sup>1</sup> ἀξιοῖ τὴν φιλομαθὴ καὶ φιλόσοφον φύσιν, οἷος ἀσπάξασθαι πᾶν μῆθημα καὶ μηδὲν λόγου μηδὲ παιδείας ἀτιμίζειν εἶδος, ἐρρήν πως προθυμότερον ἐπὶ ποιητικῇ. Καὶ τι καὶ ποιημάτων ἔτι παιδὸς αὐτοῦ διασώζεται, Πόντιος Γλαῦκος, ἐν τετραμέτρῳ πεποιημένον. Προῖον δὲ τῷ χρόνῳ καὶ ποικιλώτερον ἀπτόμενος τῆς περὶ ταῦτα μούσης ἔδοξεν οὐ μόνον ῥήτωρ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ποιητῆς ἄριστος εἶναι Ῥωμαίων. Ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ τῇ ῥητορικῇ δόξα μέχρι νῦν διαμένει, καίπερ οὐ μικρὰς γεγενημένης περὶ τοὺς λόγους καινοτομίας,<sup>2</sup> τὴν δὲ ποιητικὴν αὐτοῦ, πολλῶν εὐφυῶν ἐπιγενομένων, παντάπασιν ἀκλεῆ καὶ ἄτιμον<sup>3</sup> ἔρρειν συμβέβηκεν.

5. III. Ἀπαλλαγείς δὲ τῶν ἐν παισὶ διατριβῶν Φίλωνος ἤκουσε τοῦ<sup>88 B.C.</sup> ἐξ Ἀκαδημείας,<sup>4</sup> ὃν μάλιστα Ῥωμαῖοι τῶν Κλειτομάχου συνήθων καὶ διὰ τὸν λόγον ἐθαύμασαν καὶ διὰ τὸν τρόπον ἡγάγησαν. Ἄμα δὲ τοῖς περὶ Μούκιον<sup>89-85 B.C.</sup> ἀνδράσι συνῶν<sup>5</sup> πολιτικοῖς καὶ πρωτεύουσι τῆς βουλῆς εἰς ἐμπειρίαν τῶν νόμων ὠφελεῖτο.

6. καί τινα χρόνον καὶ στρατείας μετέσχεν ὑπὸ Σύλλα περὶ τὸν Μαρσικὸν<sup>89 B.C.</sup> πόλεμον.<sup>6</sup>

7. Ἐλθ' ὁρῶν εἰς στάσιν, ἐκ δὲ τῆς στάσεως εἰς ἄκρατον ἐμπίπτοντα τὰ πράγματα μοναρχίαν,<sup>7</sup> ἐπὶ τὸν σχολαστὴν καὶ θεωρητικὸν ἐλθὼν βίον Ἑλλῆσι συνῆν φιλολόγοις καὶ προσείχε τοῖς μαθήμασιν,<sup>8</sup> ἄχρι οὗ Σύλλας<sup>82 B.C.</sup> ἐκάρησε καὶ κατὰστασιν τινα λαμβάνειν ἔδοξεν ἢ πόλιν.

8. Ἐν δὲ τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ Χρυσόγονος ἀπελευθέρους Σύλλα προσαγγείλας<sup>81 B.C.</sup> τινὸς οὐσίαν ὥς ἐκ προγραφῆς ἀναιρεθέντος<sup>9</sup> αὐτὸς ἐωνήσατο δυσχελίων<sup>80 B.C.</sup> δραχμῶν. Ἐπεὶ δὲ Ῥώσκιος ὁ υἱὸς καὶ κληρονόμος τοῦ τεθνηκότος ἡγάνακται καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν ἀπεδείκνυε πεντήκοντα καὶ διακοσίων ταλάντων οὐσαν ἀξίαν,<sup>10</sup> ὃ τε Σύλλας ἐλεγχόμενος ἐχαλέπαινε καὶ δίκην πατροκτονίας ἐπῆγε τῷ

<sup>1</sup> (A) Plato *de rep.* V. 466.

<sup>2</sup> (A) Cp. Tac. *Dial.* 19-23.

<sup>3</sup> (A) Cp. Tac. *Dial.* 21, fecerunt enim et carmina . . . non melius quam Cicero sed felicius quia illos fecisse pauciores sciunt, to which passage I have collected the numerous corroborative criticisms (p. 235).

<sup>4</sup> (D) \* Cic. *ad fam.* XIII. 1, 2.

<sup>5</sup> (A) Cic. *de amic.* I, 1.

<sup>6</sup> (D) Cic. *Phil.* XII. 11, 27, Cn. Pompeius, S. F., consul, me praesente cum essem tiro in eius exercitu cum . . . duce Marsorum . . . collocutus est.

<sup>7</sup> (A) These events had been related at length in the earlier Life of Sulla.

<sup>8</sup> (A) To this period belong the *de inventione* and the translation of Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*. Cp. also *Brut.* 90, 308 ff.; *de off.* II. 24, 87.

<sup>9</sup> (A) Cic. *pro Rosc. Am.* 11, 32, occisum in proscriptorum numerum rettulisti; I, 1-4, 2, 5; Quint. XII. 6, 3, summis audientium clamoribus dixerit; Gell. *N. A.* XV. 28, 3, florentissimam orationem.

<sup>10</sup> (D) Cic. *l.c.* 2, 6, duobus milibus nummum (= \$75, not \$370); 8, 21, imprudente L. Sulla facta esse certe scio etc.; 9, 25, 38, 110, 45, 130 f.

ῥωσκήῃ,<sup>1</sup> τοῦ Χρυσογόνου κατασκευάσαντος, ἐβοήθει δ' οὐδεὶς, ἀλλ' ἀπετρεπonto τοῦ Σύλλα τὴν χαλεπότητα δεδοικότες, οὕτω δὲ δι' ἐρημίας τοῦ μεираκίου τῷ Κικέρωνι προσφυνγόντος οἱ φίλοι συμπαρωρμῶν, ὧς οὐκ ἂν αὐτῷ λαμπροτέραν αὐθις ἀρχὴν πρὸς δόξαν ἐτέραν οὐδὲ καλλίω γενησομένην. Ἀναδεξάμενος οὖν τὴν συνηγορίαν καὶ κατορθώσας ἐθανμάσθη.<sup>2</sup>

9. δεδιὼς δὲ τὸν Σύλλαν ἀπεδήμησεν εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα,<sup>3</sup> διασπείρας λόγον, ὡς τοῦ σώματος αὐτῷ θεραπείας δεομένου. Καὶ γὰρ ἦν ὄντως ἰσχνὸς καὶ ἄσαρκος, ἀρρωστίᾳ στομάχου μικρὰ καὶ γλίσχρα μόγις ὀψὲ τῆς ὥρας προκφερόμενος.<sup>4</sup> ἡ δὲ φωνὴ πολλὴ μὲν καὶ ἀγαθή, σκληρὰ δὲ καὶ ἄπλαστος, ὑπὸ δὲ τοῦ λόγου σφοδρότητα καὶ πάθος ἔχοντος αἰεὶ διὰ τῶν ἄνω τόνων ἐλαυνομένη φόβον παρέχεν ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος.<sup>5</sup>

79-78  
B.C.

10. IV. Ἀφικόμενος δ' εἰς Ἀθήνας Ἀντιόχου τοῦ Ἀσκαλωνίτου διήκουσε,<sup>6</sup> τῇ μὲν εὐροίᾳ τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ καὶ χάριτι κηλούμενος, ἃ δ' ἐν τοῖς δόγμασιν ἐνεωτέρειζεν οὐκ ἐπαινῶν.

11. Ἦδη γὰρ ἐξίστατο τῆς νέας λεγομένης Ἀκαδημείας ὁ Ἀντίοχος καὶ τὴν Καρνεάδου στάσιν ἐγκατέλειπεν, εἴτε καμπτόμενος ὑπὸ τῆς ἐναργείας καὶ τῶν αἰσθήσεων, εἴτε, ὥς φασιν ἔνιοι, φιλοτιμίᾳ τινὶ καὶ διαφορᾷ πρὸς τοὺς Κλειτομάχου καὶ Φίλωνος συνήθεις τὸν Στωϊκὸν<sup>6</sup> ἐκ μεταβολῆς θεραπεύων λόγον ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις.

12. Ὁ δὲ Κικέρων ἐκεῖνα ἡγάπα κακέινους προσεῖχε μᾶλλον, διανοούμενος, εἰ παντάπασιν ἐκπέσοι τοῦ τὰ κοινὰ πράσσειν, δεῦρο μετενεγκάμενος τὸν βίον ἐκ τῆς ἀγορᾶς καὶ τῆς πολιτείας ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ μετὰ φιλοσοφίας καταζῆν.<sup>7</sup>

78 B.C.

13. Ἐπεὶ δ' αὐτῷ Σύλλας τε προσηγγέλθη τεθηγκώς, καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῖς γυμνασίοις ἀναρρωννύμενον εἰς ἕξιν ἐβάδιζε νεανικὴν, ἥ τε φωνὴ λαμβάνουσα πλάσιν ἡδεῖα μὲν πρὸς ἀκοὴν ἐτέθραπτο [καὶ πολλή], μετρίως δὲ πρὸς τὴν ἕξιν ἡρμωστο τοῦ σώματος, πολλὰ μὲν τῶν ἀπὸ Ῥώμης φίλων γραφόντων καὶ δεομένων, πολλὰ δ' Ἀντιόχου παρακελευομένου τοῖς κοινοῖς ἐπιβαλεῖν πράγμασιν, αὐθις ὥσπερ ὄργανον ἐξήρτυε τὸν ῥητορικὸν λόγον καὶ ἀνεκίνει τὴν πολιτικὴν δύναμιν, αὐτόν τε ταῖς μελέταις διαπονῶν καὶ τοὺς ἐπαινουμένους μετῶν ῥήτορας.

<sup>1</sup> See note 10, p. 67.

<sup>2</sup> See note 9, p. 67; *pro Rosc. Am.* I, 1. 21, 59; *Brut.* 90, 312.

<sup>3</sup> (A) \* Hieron. in *Euseb. Chron.* (= Sueton.) *Olymp.* 175, 1; *de vir. ill.* c. 81. (D) \* *Brut.* 91, 314.

<sup>4</sup> (A) *Brut.* 91, 313, erat eo tempore in nobis summa gracilitas et infirmitas corporis, procerum et tenue collum qui habitus et quae figura non procul abesse putatur a vitae periculo si accedit labor et laterum magna contentio.

(D) *Brut.* I. c.

<sup>5</sup> (A) Cic. *de leg.* I. 21, 54; *Acad.* I. 4, 13.

<sup>6</sup> (A) *Acad.* II. 43, 132, erat quidem . . . germanissimus Stoicus.

<sup>7</sup> (D) These designs belong to a later period in Cicero's life. Cp. c. 40 and *ad Att.* II. 5, 2. 12, 4. 16, 3; IV. 16, 10; IX. 4, 2. 9.

14. Ὅθεν εἰς Ἀσίαν καὶ Ῥόδον ἔπλευσε, καὶ τῶν μὲν Ἀσισιῶν ῥητόρων 78 B.C. Ξενοκλῆ τῷ Ἀδραμυττηνῷ καὶ Διονυσίῳ τῷ Μάγνητι καὶ Μενίπῳ τῷ Καρὶ συνεσχόλασεν, ἐν δὲ Ῥόδῳ ῥήτορι μὲν Ἀπολλωνίῳ τῷ Μόλωνος,<sup>1</sup> φιλοσόφῳ δὲ Ποσειδωνίῳ.<sup>2</sup>

Λέγεται<sup>3</sup> δὲ τὸν Ἀπολλώνιον οὐ συνιέντα τὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν διάλεκτον δεηθῆναι τοῦ Κικέρωνος Ἑλληνιστὶ μελετῆσαι· τὸν δ' ὑπακοῦσαι προθύμως, αἰόμενον οὕτως ἔσεσθαι βελτίονα τὴν ἐπ' ἀνόρθωσιν· ἐπεὶ δ' ἐμελέτησε, τοῖς μὲν ἄλλοις ἐκπεπληῆσθαι καὶ διαμιλλᾶσθαι πρὸς ἀλλήλους τοῖς ἐπαίνοις, τὸν δ' Ἀπολλώνιον οὐτ' ἀκροώμενον αὐτοῦ διαχυθῆναι καὶ πανσαμένον σύννοιον καθέζεσθαι πολὺν χρόνον, ἀχθομένου δὲ τοῦ Κικέρωνος εἰπεῖν· “Σὲ μὲν, ὦ Κικέρων, ἐπαινῶ καὶ θαυμάζω, τῆς δὲ Ἑλλάδος οἰκτείρω τὴν τύχην, ὅρων, ἃ μόνον τῶν καλῶν ἡμῶν ὑπελείπετο, καὶ ταῦτα Ῥωμαῖοις διὰ σοῦ προσγεγόμενα, παιδείαν καὶ λόγον.”

15. V. Ὁ γοῦν Κικέρων ἐλπίδων μεστὸς ἐπὶ τὴν πολιτείαν φερόμενος ὑπὸ χρησμοῦ τινος ἀπημβλύνθη τὴν ὁρμήν. Ἐρομένῳ γὰρ αὐτῷ τὸν ἐν Δελφοῖς θεόν, ὅπως ἂν ἐνδοξότατος γένοιτο, προσέταξεν ἡ Πυθία τὴν αὐτοῦ φύσιν, ἀλλὰ μὴ τὴν τῶν πολλῶν δόξαν ἡγεμόνα ποιέεσθαι τοῦ βίου.<sup>4</sup>

16. Καὶ τὸν γε πρῶτον ἐν Ῥώμῃ χρόνον εὐλαβῶς διῆγε καὶ ταῖς ἀρχαῖς 77 B.C. ὀκνηρῶς προσήει καὶ παρημελεῖτο,<sup>5</sup> ταῦτα δὲ τὰ Ῥωμαίων τοῖς βαναυστοτάτοις πρόχειρα καὶ συνήθη ῥήματα, Γραικοὶ<sup>6</sup> καὶ σχολαστικοὶ ἀκούουν.

Ἐπεὶ δὲ φύσει φιλότιμος ὦν καὶ παροξυνόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τῶν φίλων ἐπέδωκεν εἰς τὸ συνηγορεῖν ἑαυτόν, οὐκ ἡρέμα τῷ πρωτεύῳ προσήγεν, ἀλλ' εὐθὺς ἐξέλαμψε τῇ δόξῃ καὶ διέφερε πολὺ τῶν ἀγωνιζομένων ἐπ' ἀγορᾶς.

17. Λέγεται δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς οὐδὲν ἦττον νοήσας τοῦ Δημοσθένους πρὸς τὴν ὑπόκρισιν,<sup>7</sup> τοῦτο μὲν Ῥωσκή τῷ κωμωδῷ, τοῦτο δ' Αἰσώπῳ τῷ τραγῳδῷ προσέχειν ἐπιμελῶς.<sup>8</sup>

18. Τὸν δ' Αἰσώπον τοῦτον ἱστοροῦσιν ὑποκρινόμενον ἐν θεάτρῳ τὸν περὶ τῆς τιμωρίας τοῦ Θυέστου βουλευόμενον Ἀτρεά, τῶν ὑπηρετῶν τινος

<sup>1</sup> (D) \* Cic. *Brut.* 91, 317.

<sup>2</sup> (D) \* Cic. *Brut.* l.c.

<sup>3</sup> (A) \* *de vir. ill.* 81. Cp. also *Tusc. Disp.* II. 2, 5.

(D) \* Cic. *Brut.* 91, 316.

<sup>4</sup> (D) \* Cic. *de div.* II. 56, 115 ff. (attack on the Delphic oracle).

<sup>5</sup> (D) \* Cic. *Brut.* 92, 318.

<sup>6</sup> (A) Calenus ap. Dion. Cass. XLVI. 18, 1, ὦ Κικέρων ἢ Κικέρκουλε ἢ Κικεράκιε ἢ Γραικούλε ἢ ὅ τι ποτὲ καὶ χαίρεις ὀνομαζόμενος *ad Att.* I. 15, 1.

<sup>7</sup> (A) Cic. *de orat.* III. 56, 213; *Brut.* 38, 142; *Orat.* 17, 56, ut iam non sine causa Demosthenes tribuerit et primas et secundas et tertias actioni.

<sup>8</sup> (A) Macrobi. *Satur.* II. 10, Roscio et Aesopo histrionibus tam familiariter usum ut res rationesque eorum sua sollertia tueretur.

(D) Cicero's friendship for these actors is attested by many passages, but he nowhere confirms the above statement.



ἄφνω παραδραμόντος, ἔξω τῶν ἑαυτοῦ λογισμῶν διὰ τὸ πάθος<sup>1</sup> ὄντα τῷ σκίπτρῳ πατάξαι καὶ ἀνελεῖν.

19. Οὐ μικρὰ δὲ πρὸς τὸ πείθειν ὑπῆρχεν ἐκ τοῦ ὑποκρίνεσθαι ῥοπή τῷ Κικέρωνι. Καὶ τοὺς γε τῷ βοᾶν μεγαλαυχουμένους ῥήτορας ἐπισκώπτων ἔλεγε δι' ἀσθένειαν ἐπὶ τὴν κραυγὴν ὥσπερ χωλοὺς ἐφ' ἵππον πηδᾶν.

20. Ἡ δὲ περὶ τὰ σκώμματα καὶ τὴν παιδιὰν ταύτην εὐτραπέλεια δικανικὸν μὲν ἐδόκει καὶ γλαφυρόν, χρώμενος δ' αὐτῇ κατακόρως πολλοὺς ἐλύπει καὶ κακοθηθείας ἐλάμβανε δόξαν.

75 B.C. 21. VI. Ἀποδειχθεὶς δὲ ταμίης ἐν σιτοδείᾳ καὶ λαχὼν Σικελίαν ἠνώχλησε<sup>2</sup> τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐν ἀρχῇ σίτον εἰς Ῥώμην ἀποστέλλειν<sup>3</sup> ἀναγκαζομένοις. Ὑστερον δὲ τῆς ἐπιμελείας καὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ πρῶτοντος αὐτοῦ πείραν λαμβάνοντες ὡς οὐδένα τῶν πώποθ' ἡγεμόνων ἐτίμησαν.<sup>4</sup>

22. Ἐπεὶ δὲ πολλοὶ τῶν ἀπὸ Ῥώμης νέων ἐνδοξοὶ καὶ γεγενησὶ καλῶς αἰτίαν ἔχοντες ἀταξίας καὶ μαλακίας περὶ τὸν πόλεμον ἀνεπέμφθησαν ἐπὶ τὸν στρατηγὸν τῆς Σικελίας, συνέειπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Κικέρων ἐπιφανῶς καὶ περιειποίησεν.

74 B.C. 23. Ἐπὶ τούτοις οὖν μέγα φρονῶν<sup>5</sup> εἰς Ῥώμην βαδίζων γελοῖον τι παθεῖν φησι.<sup>6</sup> Συντυχὼν γὰρ ἀνδρὶ τῶν ἐπιφανῶν φίλῳ δοκοῦντι περὶ Καμπανίαν, ἐρέσθαι, τίνα δὴ τῶν πεπραγμένων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ λόγον ἔχουσι Ῥωμαῖοι καὶ τί φρονοῦσιν, ὡς ὀνόματος καὶ δόξης τῶν πεπραγμένων αὐτῷ τὴν πόλιν ἄσπασαν ἐμπεπληκώς· τὸν δ' εἶπεν· “Ποῦ γὰρ ἦς, ὦ Κικέρων, τὸν χρόνον τούτον;” τότε μὲν οὖν ἐξαθνημῆσαι παντάπασιν, εἰ καθάπερ εἰς πέλαγος ἀχανὲς τὴν πόλιν ἐμπεσὼν ὁ περὶ αὐτοῦ λόγος οἰδὲν εἰς δόξαν ἐπίδηλον πεποίηκεν· ὕστερον δὲ λογισμὸν ἑαυτῷ διδοὺς πολὺ τῆς φιλοτιμίας ὑφείλεν, ὡς πρὸς ἀόριστον πρᾶγμα τὴν δόξαν ἀμειψόμενος καὶ πέρας οὐκ ἐφικτὸν ἔχουσαν. Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ τό γε χαίρειν ἐπαινούμενον διαφερόντως καὶ πρὸς δόξαν ἐμπαθέστερον ἔχειν ἄχρι παντὸς αὐτῷ παρέμεινε καὶ πολλοὺς πολλάκις τῶν ὀρθῶν ἐπετάραξε λογισμῶν.

24. VII. Ἀπτόμενος δὲ τῆς πολιτείας προθυμότερον αἰσχροὺς ἡγεῖτο τοὺς μὲν βαναύσους ὀργάνους χρωμένους καὶ σκεύεισιν ἀνύχους μηδενὸς

<sup>1</sup> (A) Cic. *de div.* 37, 80, in te saepe vidi et . . . in Aesopo, familiari tuo, tantum ardorem vultuum atque motuum ut eum vis quaedam abstraxisse a sensu mentis videretur.

(D) \* Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* IV. 25, 55.

<sup>2</sup> (D) Cic. *in Verr.* II. 3, 78, 182; *pro Planc.* 26, 63.

<sup>3</sup> (A) Cic. *pro Planc.* 26, 64, frumenti in summa caritate maximum numerum miseram (sc. Romam).

<sup>4</sup> (A) Cic. *pro Planc.* l.c. excogitati quidam erant a Siculis honores in me inauditi.

<sup>5</sup> (A) Cic. l.c. hac spe decedebam ut mihi populum Romanum ultro omnia delaturum putarem.

<sup>6</sup> (D) \* Cic. l.c. See p. 14 f.

ἀγνοεῖν ὄνομα μὴδὲ χώρην ἢ δύναμιν αὐτῶν, τὸν δὲ πολιτικόν, ᾧ δι' ἀνθρώπων αἱ κοινὰ πράξεις περαίνονται, ῥαθύνως καὶ ἀμελῶς ἔχειν περὶ τὴν τῶν πολιτῶν γνῶσιν.<sup>1</sup> Ὅθεν οὐ μόνον τῶν ὀνομάτων εἰθίξε μνημονεύειν αὐτόν,<sup>1</sup> ἀλλὰ καὶ τόπον, ἐν ᾧ τῶν γνωρίμων ἕκαστος οἰκεῖ, καὶ χωρίον, οὗ κέκτεται, καὶ φίλους, οἷσιτισι χρῆται, καὶ γείτονας ἐγίνωσκε· καὶ πᾶσαν ὁδὸν Ἰταλίας διαπορευομένῳ Κικέρωνι πρόχειρον ἦν εἰπεῖν καὶ ἐπιδείξει τοὺς τῶν φίλων ἀγροὺς καὶ τὰς ἐπαύλεις.

25. Οὐσίαν δὲ μικρὰν μὲν, ἱκανὴν δὲ καὶ ταῖς δαπάναις ἐπαρκῆ κεκτημένος ἐθανμάζετο μῆτε μισθοὺς μῆτε δῶρα προσιέμενος ἀπὸ τῆς συνηγορίας, μάλιστα δ' ὅτε τὴν κατὰ Βέρρου δίκην ἀνέλαβε.

26. Τοῦτον γὰρ στρατηγὸν γεγονότα τῆς Σικελίας καὶ πολλὰ πεπονηρμένον τῶν Σικελιωτῶν διωκόντων εἶλεν, οὐκ εἰπὼν, ἀλλ' ἐξ αὐτοῦ τρόπον τοιοῦτον τὸ μὴ εἰπεῖν.<sup>2</sup> Τῶν γὰρ στρατηγῶν τῷ Βέρρῳ χαριζομένων καὶ τὴν δίκην υπερθέσει καὶ διακρούσει πολλαῖς εἰς τὴν ὑστάτην<sup>3</sup> ἐκβαλλόντων, ὡς ἦν πρόδηλον, ὅτι τοῖς λόγοις ὁ τῆς ἡμέρας<sup>4</sup> οὐκ ἐξαρκεῖται χρόνος οὐδὲ λήψεται πέρας ἢ κρίσις,<sup>5</sup> ἀναστὰς ὁ Κικέρων ἔφη μὴ δεῖσθαι λόγων, ἀλλ' ἐπαγαγὼν τοὺς μάρτυρας καὶ ἐπικρίνας ἐκέλευσε φέρειν τὴν ψῆφον τοὺς δικαστάς.<sup>2</sup>

27. Ὅμως δὲ πολλὰ χαρίεντα διαμνημονεύεται καὶ περὶ ἐκείνην αὐτοῦ τὴν δίκην. Ὡς οὖν ἀπελευθερικὸς ἄνθρωπος ἔνοχος τῷ ἰουδαΐζειν ὄνομα Κεκίλιος ἐβούλετο παρωσάμενος τοὺς Σικελιώτας κατηγορεῖν τοῦ Βέρρου "Τί Ἰουδαῖψ πρὸς χοῖρον;" ἔφη ὁ Κικέρων.<sup>4</sup> Βέρρην γὰρ οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι τὸν ἐκτετρημένον χοῖρον καλοῦσιν. Ἦν δὲ τῷ Βέρρῳ ἀντίπαις υἱὸς οὐκ ἔλενθερίως δοκῶν προῖστασθαι τῆς ὥρας. Λοιδορηθεὶς οὖν ὁ Κικέρων εἰς μαλακίαν ὑπὸ τοῦ Βέρρου "Τοῖς υἱοῖς," εἶπεν "ἐντὸς θυρῶν δεῖ λοιδορεῖσθαι."

Τοῦ δὲ ῥήτορος Ὀρτησίον τὴν μὲν εὐθείαν τῷ Βέρρῳ συνεπεῖν μὴ τολμήσαντος,<sup>5</sup> ἐν δὲ τῷ τιμήματι πεισθέντος παραγενέσθαι καὶ λαβόντος

<sup>1</sup> (A) [Q. Cicero] *de pet. cons.* 11, 41, *petitio desiderat nomenclationem, blanditiam, assiduitatem, benignitatem.*

(D) Cic. *ad Att.* IV. 1, 5, *ad urbem ita veni, ut nemo ullius ordinis homo nomenclatori notus fuerit qui mihi obviam non venerit.*

(A) Cic. *pro Mur.* 36, 77, *quid? quod habes nomenclatorem, in eo quidem fallis . . . nam si nomine appellari abs te cives tuos honestum est, turpe est eos notiores esse servo tuo quam tibi etc.*

<sup>2</sup> (A) *in Verr.* I. 10, 31 ff.; Ps. Ascon. *in Verr.* I p. 126 f.; Quint. VI. 6, 4.

<sup>3</sup> (D) *in Verr.* l.c.

<sup>4</sup> = Quid Iudaeus cum Verre? For other Ciceronian puns on Verres, cp. my note to Tac. *Dial.* c. 23 (p. 249).

<sup>5</sup> (A) Cic. *in Verr.* II. 1, 7, 20; *Orat.* 37, 129; Ps. Ascon. *in Verr.* pp. 126, 153, *adeo stupefactus Hortensius dicitur ut rationem defensionis omitteret.*

ἐλεφαντίνην<sup>1</sup> Σφίγγα μισθόν, εἰπέ τι πλαγίως ὁ Κικέρων πρὸς αὐτόν· τοῦ δὲ φήσαντος αἰνυμάτων λύσεως ἀπείρως ἔχειν· “Καὶ μὴν ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας τὴν Σφίγγα ἔχεις.”

28. VIII. Οὕτω δὲ τοῦ Βέρρου καταδικασθέντος<sup>2</sup> ἑβδομήκοντα πέντε μυριάδων τιμησάμενος<sup>3</sup> τὴν δίκην ὁ Κικέρων διαβολὴν ἔσχεν, ὥς ἐπ’ ἀργυρίῳ τὸ τίμημα καθυφειμένος.<sup>4</sup>

69 B.C. Οὐ μὴν ἀλλ’ οἱ Σικελιώται χάριν εἰδότες ἀγορανομούντος αὐτοῦ<sup>4</sup> πολλὰ μὲν ἄγοντες ἀπὸ τῆς νήσου, πολλὰ δὲ φέροντες ἦκον, ὧν οὐδὲν ἐποιήσατο κέρδος, ἀλλ’ ὅσον ἐπευνώϊσαι τὴν ἀγορὰν ἀπεχρήσατο τῇ φιλοτιμίᾳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

29. Ἐκέκτητο δὲ χωρίον καλὸν ἐν Ἄρποις,<sup>5</sup> καὶ περὶ Νέαν πόλιν ἣν ἀγρὸς καὶ περὶ Πομπηίους ἕτερος, οὐ μεγάλοι· φερνὴ τε Τερεντίας τῆς γυναῖκος προσεγένετο μυριάδων δέκα, καὶ κληρονομία τις εἰς ἑννέα δηναρίων συναχθεῖσα μυριάδας.

30. Ἀπὸ τούτων ἐλευθερίως ἅμα καὶ σωφρόνως διῆγε μετὰ τῶν συμβιούντων Ἑλλήνων<sup>6</sup> καὶ Ῥωμαίων φιλολόγων, σπάνιον, εἴ ποτε, πρὸ δυσμῶν ἡλίον κατακλινόμενος, οὐχ οὕτω δι’ ἀσχολίαν, ὥς διὰ τὸ σῶμα τῷ στομάχῳ μοχθηρῶς διακείμενον. Ἦν δὲ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην περὶ τὸ σῶμα θεραπείαν ἀκριβῆς καὶ περιττός, ὥστε καὶ τρύψεσι καὶ περιπάτοις<sup>7</sup> ἀριθμῷ τεταγμένοις χρῆσθαι. Τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον διαπαιδαγωγῶν τὴν ἑξὶν ἄνοσον<sup>8</sup> καὶ διαρκῇ πρὸς πολλοὺς καὶ μεγάλους ἀγῶνας καὶ πόνους συνέχευεν.

61 B.C. 31. Οἰκίαν δὲ τὴν μὲν πατρῶαν τῷ ἀδελφῷ παρεχώρησεν, αὐτὸς δ’ ἔκει περὶ τὸ Παλάτιον<sup>9</sup> ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ μακρὰν βαδίζοντας ἐνοχλεῖσθαι τοὺς θεραπεύοντας αὐτόν.

<sup>1</sup> (D) Plin. *N. H.* XXXIV. 48, 8 speaks of Corinthian bronze, in Quint. VI. 3, 98 it is a Sphinx aenea, and according to Plut. *Ἀποφθ.* 11 it was of silver. Otherwise the stories are identical.

<sup>2</sup> (D) Ps. Ascon. ll.cc. adeo percussus Verres ut abiret in exilium sua sponte.

<sup>3</sup> (D) Ps. Ascon. p. 152; Cic. *Div. in Caec.* 5, 19, abs te sestertium milies ex lege repetito.

<sup>4</sup> (A) in *Verr.* I. 18, 56 and Ps. Ascon. p. 106 *frustra calumniantur Ciceronem quidam homines et modo eum sestertium milies dicunt repetere, modo quadringenties.* But cp. Plut. c. 7 *μήτε δῶρα ἀνέλαβε.*

<sup>5</sup> (A) \* Mart. IV. 55, 3.

<sup>6</sup> (A) \* Cic. *de nat. deor.* I. 3, 5, *doctissimorum hominum familiaritates quibus semper domus nostra floruit.*

<sup>7</sup> (A) Cic. *ad Quint. frat.* III. 3, 1; *ad Att.* II. 23, 1.

<sup>8</sup> (A) \* Asin. Poll. ap. Sen. *Suas.* VI. 24.

<sup>9</sup> (D) This house was purchased after his consulship. Cp. Cic. *ad fam.* V. 6, 2; *ad Att.* I. 16, 10; Gell. *N. A.* XII. 12, 1. The topics 29 ff. are disjointed and accumulated without reference to chronology. Plutarch had nothing to say about the aedileship, and these items are put in to fill the gap, as it were.



Ἐθεράπευον δὲ καθ' ἡμέραν ἐπὶ θύρας φοιτῶντες οὐκ ἐλάττωτες ἢ Κράτισον ἐπὶ πλούτῳ καὶ Πομπήϊον διὰ τὴν ἐν τοῖς στρατεύμασι δύναμιν, θυμολομένοισι μάλιστα Ῥωμαίων καὶ μεγίστους ὄντας.

Πομπήϊος δὲ καὶ Κικέρωνι ἐθεράπευε, καὶ μεγάλα πρὸς δύναμιν αὐτῷ καὶ δόξαν ἢ Κικέρωνος συνέπραξε πολιτεία.

32. IX. Στρατηγῶν δὲ μετιόντων ἅμα σὺν αὐτῷ πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων 66 B.C. πρῶτος ἀπάντων ἀνηγορεύθη.<sup>1</sup> καὶ τὰς κρίσεις ἔδοξε καθαρῶς καὶ καλῶς βραβεύσαι.

Λέγεται δὲ καὶ Λικίνιος Μάκερ, ἀνὴρ καὶ καθ' αὐτὸν ἰσχύων ἐν τῇ πόλει μέγα καὶ Κράσῳ χρώμενος βοηθῷ, κρινόμενος κλοπῆς ἐπ' αὐτοῦ, τῇ δυνάμει καὶ σπουδῇ πεποισμένος, ἔτι τὴν ψήφον τῶν κριτῶν διαφερόντων ἀπαλλαγείς οἰκαδὲ κείρασθαί τε τὴν κεφαλὴν κατὰ τάχος καὶ καθαρὸν ἱμάτιον ὡς νενικηκώς λαβὼν αὐθις εἰς ἀγορὰν προϊέναι· τοῦ δὲ Κράσσου περὶ τὴν αὐλεῖον ἀπαντήσαντος αὐτῷ καὶ φράσαντος, ὅτι πάσαις ἐάλωκε ταῖς ψήφοις, ἀναστρέψας καὶ κατακλινεῖς ἀποθνεῖν.<sup>2</sup> Τὸ δὲ πρᾶγμα τῷ Κικέρωνι δόξαν ἤνεγκεν ὡς ἐπιμελῶς βραβεύσαντι τὸ δικαστήριον.<sup>3</sup>

Ἐπεὶ δὲ Οὐατίνιος, ἀνὴρ ἔχων τι τραχὺ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἄρχοντας ὀλίγωρον ἐν ταῖς συνηγορίαις, χοιράδων δὲ τὸν τράχηλον περίπλεως, ἡτείτο τι καταστάς παρὰ τοῦ Κικέρωνος, καὶ μὴ διδόντος, ἀλλὰ βουλευομένου πολὺν χρόνον, εἶπεν, ὡς οὐκ ἂν αὐτὸς διατάσσει περὶ τούτου στρατηγῶν, ἐπιστραφεὶς ὁ Κικέρων “Ἄλλ' ἐγώ,” εἶπεν, “οὐκ ἔχω τηλικούτον τράχηλον.”<sup>4</sup>

Ἔτι δ' ἡμέρας δύο ἢ τρεῖς ἔχοντι τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτῷ προσήγαγί τις Μανίλιον εὐθύνην κλοπῆς.<sup>5</sup> Ὁ δὲ Μανίλιος οὗτος εὖνοιαν εἶχε καὶ σπουδὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου, δοκῶν ἐλαύνεσθαι διὰ Πομπήϊον· ἐκείνου γὰρ ἦν φίλος. Αἰτουμένου δ' ἡμέρας αὐτοῦ μίαν ὁ Κικέρων μόνην τὴν ἐπιούσαν ἔδωκε· καὶ ὁ δῆμος ἡγανάκτησεν εἰθισμένων τῶν στρατηγῶν δέκα τοῦλάχιστον ἡμέρας διδόναι τοῖς κινδυνεύουσι. Τῶν δὲ δημάρχων αὐτὸν διαγαγόντων ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα καὶ κατηγορούντων, ἀκουσθῆναι δεηθεὶς εἶπεν, ὅτι τοῖς κινδυνεύουσιν αἰεὶ, καθ' ὅσον οἱ νόμοι παρείκουσι, κεκρημένος ἐπιεικῶς καὶ φιλανθρωπῶς δεινὸν ἡγήτο τῷ Μανιλίῳ ταῦτα μὴ παρασχεῖν· τῆς οὖν ἔτι μόνης κύριος ἦν ἡμέρας στρατηγῶν,

<sup>1</sup> (A) Cic. *Brut.* 93, 321; *pro lege Man.* I. 2, ter praetor primus centuriis cunctis renuntiatus sum.

<sup>2</sup> (D) \* Cic. *ad Att.* I. 4, 2; Val. Max. IX. 12, 7 (suicide before conviction).

<sup>3</sup> (A) \* Cic. l.c. nos incredibili ac singulari populi voluntati de C. Macro transegimus. Cui cum aequi fuisset, tamen multo maiorem fructum ex populi existimatione, illo damnato, quam ex ipsius si absolutus esset, gratia cepissemus.

<sup>4</sup> (A) Cic. *pro Sest.* 65, 135 strumam civitatis (cp. Schol. Bob. p. 310); *in Vat.* 4, 10 (cp. Schol. Bob. p. 316); *in Vat.* 2, 4, inflato collo, tumidis cervicibus intulisti. This particular retort is, however, not found elsewhere. Cp. Kurtz, *Philol.* 36, p. 569.

<sup>5</sup> (D) \* Dio Cass. XXXVI. 44.

ταύτην ἐπίτηδες ὀρίσαι· τὸ γὰρ εἰς ἄλλον ἄρχοντα τὴν κρίσιν ἐκβαλεῖν οὐκ εἶναι βουλομένον βοηθεῖν. Ταῦτα λεχθέντα θαυμαστὴν ἐποίησε τοῦ δήμου μεταβολήν· καὶ πολλὰ κατευφημοῦντες αὐτὸν ἐδέοντο τὴν ὑπὲρ τοῦ Μανιλίου συνηγορίαν ἀναλαβεῖν. Ὁ δ' ὑπέστη προθύμως, οὐχ ἡκίστα διὰ Πομπηίου ἀπόντα· καὶ καταστὰς πάλιν ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς ἐδημηγόρησε, νεανικῶς τῶν ὀλιγαρχικῶν καὶ τῷ Πομπηίῳ φθονούντων καθαπτόμενος.

64 B.C. 33. X. Ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν ὑπατείαν οὐχ ἦττον ὑπὸ τῶν ἀριστοκρατικῶν ἢ τῶν πολλῶν προήχθη διὰ τὴν πόλιν ἐξ αἰτίας αὐτῷ τοιαύτης συναγωνισαμένων.

63 B.C. Τῆς ὑπὸ Σύλλα γενομένης μεταβολῆς περὶ τὴν πολιτείαν ἐν ἀρχῇ μὲν ἀτόπου φανείσης, τότε δὲ τοῖς πολλοῖς ὑπὸ χρόνου καὶ συνηθείας ἤδη τιὰ κατὰστασιν ἔχειν οὐ φαύλην δοκούσης,<sup>1</sup> ἦσαν οἱ τὰ παρόντα διασεῖσαι καὶ μεταθεῖναι ζητοῦντες ἰδίῳ ἐνεκα πλεονεξιῶν,<sup>2</sup> οὐ πρὸς τὸ βέλτιστον, Πομπηίου μὲν ἔτι τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν ἐν Πόντῳ καὶ Ἀρμενίᾳ πολεμοῦντος, ἐν δὲ τῇ Ῥώμῃ μηδεμιᾶς ὑφεστώσης πρὸς τοὺς νεωτερίζοντας ἀξιωμαχοῦν δυνάμεως. Οὗτοι κορυφαῖον εἶχον ἄνδρα τολμητὴν καὶ μεγαλοπράγμονα καὶ ποικίλον τὸ ἦθος,<sup>3</sup> Λεύκιον Κατιλίαν, ὃς αἰτίαν ποτὲ πρὸς ἄλλοις ἀδικήμασι μεγάλοις ἔλαβε παρθένῳ συγγεγονέναι θυγατρί,<sup>4</sup> κτεῖναι δ' ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ.<sup>5</sup> καὶ δίκην ἐπὶ τούτῳ φοβούμενος ἔπεισε Σύλλαν ὥς ἔτι ζῶντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐν τοῖς ἀποθανουμένοις προγράψαι.<sup>6</sup> Τοῦτον οὖν προστάτην οἱ πονηροὶ λαβόντες ἄλλας τε πίστει ἀλλήλοις

The chief extant narratives of the Conspiracy (c. 10-23) are: Cic. *in Cat.*; Sallust; Appian *B. C.* II. 2-7; Dio Cass. XXXVII. 24-42; Florus IV. 1 ff. Cp. also the special treatises cited in the Bibliography and Sibinga l.c. pp. 48-143. In the following those passages will be preferably cited which show that neither *Sallust* nor *Cicero* was directly consulted by Plutarch, *noteworthy divergences* from Cicero's statements in the *Speeches* proving by implication that the lost *ὑπόμνημα* was also *not one of his sources*.

<sup>1</sup> (A) Cic. *Brut.* 90, 311, *leges et iudicia constituta, recuperata res publica; de proscript. fil. fragm.*: ita legibus Sullae cohaerebat status civitatis ut his solutis, stare ipsa non posset.

<sup>2</sup> (D) Plutarch ignores the so-called first Catilinian conspiracy, so frequently referred to in Cicero's speeches, and narrated by Sall. 18; Dio XXV. 44.

<sup>3</sup> (A) Sall. c. 5 *animus audax, subdolos, varius*; *in Cat.* II. 5; III. 17 *tam acer quam paratus, tam audax quam callidus* etc.

(D) *Cat.* I. 10, 26; II. 4, 7 ff.; esp. Sall. c. 15 *necato filio*.

<sup>4</sup> (A) Cic. *in toga cand.* fragm.: *cum deprehendebare in adulteriis . . . cum ex eodem stupro tibi et uxorem et filiam invenisti*; [Q. Cicero] *de pet. cons.* 2, 9, *educatus est in stupro sororis*.

<sup>5</sup> (D) Cic. *in Cat.* I. 16, 13 ff., *cum morte superioris uxoris . . . domum vacuefecisses, nonne etiam alio incredibili sceleri hoc scelus cumulasti*; III. 17.

<sup>6</sup> Plut. *Sull.* 32, *ἔδοξε* etc. Not elsewhere mentioned.

ἔδοσαν καὶ καταθίσαντες ἄνθρωπον ἐγεύσαντο τῶν σαρκῶν.<sup>1</sup> Διέφθαρτο δ' ὑπ' αὐτοῦ πολὺ μέρος τῆς ἐν τῇ πόλει νεότητος.<sup>2</sup> ἡδονὰς καὶ πότους καὶ γυναικῶν ἔρωτας αἰεὶ προξενούντος ἐκάστω καὶ τὴν εἰς ταῦτα δαπάνην ἀφειδῶς παραισκειάζοντος. Ἐπῆρτο δ' ἡ τε Τυρρηνία πρὸς ἀπόστασιν ὅλη καὶ τὰ πολλὰ τῆς ἐντὸς Ἀλπεων Γαλατίας. Ἐπισφαλέστατα δ' ἡ Ῥώμη πρὸς μεταβολὴν εἶχε διὰ τὴν ἐν ταῖς οὐσίαις ἀνωμαλίαν, τῶν μὲν ἐν δόξῃ μάλιστα καὶ φρονήματι κατεπτωχευμένων εἰς θέατρα καὶ δειπνα καὶ φιλαρχίας καὶ οἰκοδομίας, τῶν δὲ πλούτων εἰς ἀγενεῖς καὶ ταπεινούς συνερρηκώτων ἀνθρώπους, ὥστε μικρὰς ῥοπῆς δεῖσθαι τὰ πράγματα καὶ παντὸς εἶναι τοῦ τολμήσαντος ἐκστῆσαι τὴν πολιτείαν αὐτὴν ὑφ' αὐτῆς νοσοῦσαν.<sup>3</sup>

XI. Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ βουλόμενος ὁ Κατιλίνας ἰσχυρόν τι προκαταλαβεῖν ὀρηγτήριον ὑπατεῖαν μετῇ· καὶ λαμπρὸς ἦν ταῖς ἐλπίσιν<sup>4</sup> ὥς Γάτω Ἀντωνίῳ συνυπατεύσων, ἀνδρὶ καθ' αὐτὸν μὲν οὐτε πρὸς τὸ βέλτιον οὐτε πρὸς τὸ χεῖρον ἡγεμονικῶ, προσθήκη δ' ἄγοντος ἐτέρου δυνάμειος ἐσομένῳ. Ταῦτα δὴ τῶν καλῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν οἱ πλεῖστοι προαισθόμενοι τὸν Κικέρωνα προῆγον ἐπὶ τὴν ὑπατείαν· καὶ τοῦ δήμου δεξαμένου προθύμως ὁ μὲν Κατιλίνας ἐξέπεσε, Κικέρων δὲ καὶ Γάιος Ἀντώνιος ἡρέθησαν. Καίτοι τῶν μετιόντων ὁ Κικέρων μόνος ἦν ἐξ ἱππικοῦ πατρός, οὐ βουλευτοῦ, γεγονώς.<sup>5</sup>

XII. Καὶ τὰ μὲν περὶ Κατιλίαν ἐμελλεν εἶτι, τοὺς πολλοὺς λανθάνοντα, προάγωνες δὲ μεγάλοι τὴν Κικέρωνος ὑπατείαν ἐξεδέξαντο.<sup>6</sup> Τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ οἱ κεκωλυμένοι κατὰ τοὺς Σύλλα νόμους ἄρχειν,<sup>7</sup> οὐτ' ἀσθενεῖς ὄντες οὐτ' ὀλίγοι, μετιόντες ἀρχὰς ἐδημαγωγούν, πολλὰ τῆς Σύλλα τυραννίδος ἀληθῆ μὲν καὶ δίκαια κατηγοροῦντες, οὐ μὴν ἐν δέοντι

<sup>1</sup> (D) \* Sall. *Cat.* 22; (A) Dio XXXVII. 30.

<sup>2</sup> (A) in *Cat.* I. 6, 13; II. 9, 20; Sall. *Cat.* 14, 5.

<sup>3</sup> (D) Sall. *Cat.* 28, 40; Cic. *Cat.* I. 2, 5; II. 8 ff.; *pro Cael.* l.c. App. *B. C.* II. 2. Agreement in substance, but not in details.

<sup>4</sup> (D) Sall. 14, Antonium quem sibi collegam speraret, has nothing in common with the Greek except the verb; nor is the epigrammatic characterization of Antonius suggested by anything in the Latin.

<sup>5</sup> Ascon. *Ped. in toga cand.* p. 88 ff. solus Cicero ex competitoribus equestri erat loco natus. Cicero attaches no importance to this, e.g. *de leg. agr.* I. 9, 27, equestri ortum loco consulem videt quae vitae via facillime viros bonos ad honorem . . . perducatur, but boasts that he was elected as a homo novus. Cp. esp. *de leg. agr.* II. 1, 3, me perlongo intervallo prope memoriae temporum nostrorum primum hominem novum consulem fecistis etc.; *pro Mur.* 8, 17; *pro Planc.* 27, 67.

<sup>6</sup> *de off.* II. 23 ff.; in *Pis.* 2, 4; *de leg. agr.* II. 3, 8.

<sup>7</sup> The speech of *proscriptorum filiis* (Cic. in *Pis.* 2) followed the *de lege agraria* and the *pro Rabirio*, here omitted. Cp. Cic. *ad Att.* II. 1, 3.



τὴν πολιτείαν οὐδὲ σὺν καιρῷ κινῶντες,<sup>1</sup> τοῦτο δὲ νόμους εἰσῆγον οἱ δήμαρχοι πρὸς τὴν αὐτὴν ὑπόθεσιν,<sup>2</sup> δεκαδαρχίαν καθιστάντες αὐτοκρατόρων ἀνδρῶν, οἷς ἐφέιτο πάσης μὲν Ἰταλίας, πάσης δὲ Συρίας καὶ ὅσα διὰ Πομπηίου νεωστὶ προσώριστο κυρίου ὄντας πωλεῖν τὰ δημόσια, κρίνειν οὓς δοκοίη, φυγάδας ἐκβάλλειν, συνοικίζειν πόλεις, χρήματα λαμβάνειν ἐκ τοῦ ταμείου, στρατιώτας τρέφειν καὶ καταλέγειν<sup>3</sup> ὅπόσων δέοντο. Διὸ καὶ τῷ νόμῳ προσεῖχον ἄλλοι τε τῶν ἐπιφανῶν καὶ πρῶτος Ἀντώνιος<sup>4</sup> ὁ τοῦ Κικέρωνος συνάρχων ὡς τῶν δέκα γενησόμενος.

Ἐδόκει δὲ καὶ τὸν Κατιλίνα<sup>4</sup> νεωτερισμὸν εἰδὼς οὐ δυσχεραίνειν ὑπὸ πλῆθους δανείων· ὁ μάλιστα τοῖς ἀρίστοις φόβον παρείχε.

Καὶ τοῦτον πρῶτον θεραπεύων ὁ Κικέρων ἐκείνῳ μὲν ἐψηφίσατο τῶν ἐπαρχῶν Μακεδονίαν,<sup>5</sup> αὐτῷ δὲ τὴν Γαλατίαν διδομένην παρητήσατο, καὶ κατειργάσατο τῇ χάριτι ταύτῃ τὸν Ἀντώνιον ὥσπερ ὑποκριτὴν ἔμυσσον αὐτῷ τὰ δεύτερα λέγειν ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος. Ὡς δ' οὗτος ἐαλώκει καὶ χειροσῆθης ἐγεγόνει, μᾶλλον ἤδη θαρρῶν ὁ Κικέρων ἐνίστατο πρὸς τοὺς καινοτομοῦντας. Ἐν μὲν οὖν τῇ βουλῇ κατηγορίαν τινὰ τοῦ νόμου διατιθέμενος οὕτως ἐξέπληξεν αὐτοὺς τοὺς εἰσφέροντας, ὥστε μηδὲν ἀντιλέγειν. Ἐπεὶ δ' αὖθις ἐπεχείρουν καὶ παρεσκευασμένοι προεκαλοῦντο τοὺς ὑπάτους ἐπὶ τὸν δῆμον,<sup>6</sup> οὐδὲν ὑποδείσας ὁ Κικέρων, ἀλλὰ τὴν βουλὴν ἔπεσθαι κελεύσας καὶ προελθὼν οὐ μόνον ἐξέβαλε τὸν νόμον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπογνῶναι τοὺς δημάρχους ἐποίησε, παρὰ τοσοῦτον τῷ λόγῳ κρατηθέντας ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.

34. XIII. Μάλιστα γὰρ οὗτος ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐπέδειξε Ῥωμαίοις ὅσον ἡδονῆς λόγος τῷ καλῷ προστίθῃσι, καὶ ὅτι τὸ δίκαιον ἀήτητόν ἐστιν, ἂν ὀρθῶς λέγεται, καὶ δεῖ τὸν ἐμμελῶς πολιτευόμενον αἰεὶ τῷ μὲν ἔργῳ τὸ καλὸν ἀντὶ τοῦ κολακεύοντος αἰρεῖσθαι, τῷ δὲ λόγῳ τὸ λυποῦν ἀφαιρεῖν τοῦ συμφέροντος. Δεῖγμα δὲ αὐτοῦ τῆς περὶ τὸν λόγον χάριτος καὶ τὸ

<sup>1</sup> Cf. § 33<sup>1</sup>, p. 74.

<sup>2</sup> oratt. III in *Rullum de leg. agr.*; Dio Cass. XXXVII. 25 f. I note the items which do not correspond with statements in these speeches.

<sup>3</sup> These provisions of the law are not found in the extant speeches. Cp. esp. *de leg. agr.* II. 7, 16 ff. 13, 33 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Neither of these is mentioned by Cicero.

<sup>5</sup> Slightly inaccurate. Gaul had fallen to the lot of Antonius, Macedonia to Cicero. The latter remained in Rome, and secured his province for Antonius, Gaul for Q. Metellus Celer. Cp. e.g. in *Pis.* 2, 4 f.; *ad fam.* VI. 2, 3; Dio Cass. XXXVII. 33.

<sup>6</sup> Refuted by *de leg. agr.* III. 1, 1, *commodius fecissent tribuni plebis, si quae apud vos de me deferunt, ea coram potius me praesente dixissent . . . sed quoniam adhuc praesens certamen . . . fugerunt, nunc . . . in meam contentionem prodeant et quo provocati a me venire noluerunt, revocati saltem revertantur.*

περὶ τὰς θίας ἐν τῇ ὑπατείᾳ γενόμενον. Τῶν γὰρ ἱππικῶν πρότερον ἐν τοῖς θεάτροις ἀναμεμιγμένων τοῖς πολλοῖς καὶ μετὰ τοῦ δήμου θεωμένων ὡς ἔτυχε, πρῶτος διέκρινεν ἐπὶ τιμῇ τοὺς ἱππίας ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων πολιτῶν Μάρκος Ὅθων στρατηγῶν, καὶ διένειμεν ἰδίαν ἐκείνοις θέαν, ἣν ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐξυίρετον ἔχουσι. Τοῦτο πρὸς ἀτιμίας ὁ δῆμος ἔλαβε, καὶ φανεῖτος ἐν θεάτρῳ τοῦ Ὅθωνος ἐφυβρίζων ἐσύριττεν, οἱ δ' ἱππεῖς ὑπέλαβον κρότφ τὸν ἄνδρα λαμπρῶς. Αὐθις δὲ ὁ δῆμος ἐπέτεινε τὸν συριγμόν, εἴτα ἐκείνοι τὸν κρότον. Ἐκ δὲ τούτου τραπόμενοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐχρῶντο λοιδοραῖαι, καὶ τὸ θέατρον ἀκοσμία κατέειχεν. Ἐπεὶ δ' ὁ Κικέρων ἦκε πυθόμενος καὶ τὸν δῆμον ἐκκαλέσας πρὸς τὸ τῆς Ἐννοῦς ἱερὸν ἐπετίμησε καὶ παρήγγεσεν, ἀπελθόντες αὐθις εἰς τὸ θέατρον ἐκρότου τὸν Ὅθωνα λαμπρῶς καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἱππίας ἄμιλλαν ἐποιοῦντο περὶ τιμῶν καὶ δόξης τοῦ ἀνδρός.<sup>1</sup>

35. XIV. Ἡ δὲ περὶ τὸν Κατιλίαν συνωμοσία πτήξασα καὶ κατὰ δέισασα τὴν ἀρχὴν αὐθις ἀνεθάρρει, καὶ συνήγον ἀλλήλους καὶ παρεκάλουν εὐτολμότερον ἄπτεσθαι τῶν πραγμάτων πρὶν ἐπανελθεῖν Πομπήϊον ἤδη λεγόμενον ὑποστρέφειν μετὰ τῆς δυνάμεως.<sup>2</sup> Μάλιστα δὲ τὸν Κατιλίαν ἐξηρέθιζον οἱ Σύλλα πάλαι στρατιῶται, διαπεφυκότες μὲν ὅλης τῆς Ἰταλίας, πλείστοι δὲ καὶ μαχιμώτατοι ταῖς Τυρρηνικαῖς ἐγκατεσπαρμένοι πόλεσιν, ἀρπαγὰς πάλιν καὶ διαφορήσεις πλούτων ἐτοιμῶν ὀνειροπολόντες.<sup>3</sup> Οὗτοι γὰρ ἡγεμόνα Μάλλιον ἔχοντες, ἄνδρα τῶν ἐπιφανῶς ὑπὸ Σύλλα στρατευσαμένων, συνίσταντο τῷ Κατιλίᾳ καὶ παρήσαν εἰς Ῥώμην συναρχαιρεσιάσοντας. Ὑπατείαν γὰρ αὐθις μετῴρει βεβουλευμένος ἀνελεῖν τὸν Κικέρωνα περὶ αὐτὸν τῶν ἀρχαιρεσιῶν τὸν θόρυβον.<sup>4</sup>

36. Ἐδόκει δὲ καὶ τὸ δαιμόνιον προσημαίνειν τὰ πρασσόμενα σεισμοῖς καὶ κερανοῖς καὶ φάσμασιν. Αἱ δ' ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων μηνύσεις ἀληθεῖς μὲν ἦσαν, οὐπω δ' εἰς ἔλεγχον ἀποχρῶσαι κατ' ἀνδρὸς ἐνδόξου καὶ δυναμένου μέγα τοῦ Κατιλίνα.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch's authority, knowing that Cicero delivered a speech *pro Othone* in this year, erroneously connected it with the *promulgation* of Otho's *lex theatralis*, four years previous (67 B.C.). See p. 37<sup>20</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> It has been supposed that this motive, not elsewhere attributed to the conspirators, was devised by Cicero, who in his *Memoirs* desired to compliment Pompey. But this view is refuted by his cold reception of the long account of the Conspiracy which Cicero sent to him (see p. 88), for Cicero would hardly have been more complimentary to Pompey in a treatise intended for the general public than in a personal letter addressed to him. Cp. *ad fam.* V. 7, 3.

<sup>3</sup> (A) Sall. c. 26; Cic. *in Cat.* II. 8, 20; Appian *B. C.* II. 2; Dio XXXVII. 30, 4.

<sup>4</sup> (A) Sall. c. 26; Dio XXXVII. 29, 2.

<sup>5</sup> (A) *in Cat.* III. 8, 18 f.; *de div.* I. 11, 17; II. 21, 47; Dio Cass. XXXVII. 9, 1.

37. Διὸ τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν ἀρχαιρεσιῶν ὑπερθέμενος ὁ Κικέρων ἐκάλει τὸν Κατιλίαν εἰς τὴν σύγκλητον καὶ περὶ τῶν λεγομένων ἀνέκρινεν. Ὁ δὲ πολλοὺς οἰόμενος εἶναι τοὺς πραγμάτων καινῶν ἐφιεμένους<sup>1</sup> ἐν τῇ βουλῇ, καὶ ἅμα τοῖς συνωμόταις ἐνδεικνύμενος, ἀπεκρίνατο τῷ Κικέρωνι μανικὴν ἀπόκρισιν. “Τί γάρ,” ἔφη, “πράττω δεινόν, εἰ, δυεῖν σωματῶν ὄντων, τοῦ μὲν ἰσχυροῦ καὶ κατεφθινηκότος, ἔχοντος δὲ κεφαλὴν, τοῦ δ’ ἀκεφάλου μὲν, ἰσχυροῦ δὲ καὶ μεγάλου, τούτῳ κεφαλὴν αὐτὸς ἐπιτίθῃμι;”<sup>2</sup> Τούτων εἰς τε τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τὸν δῆμον ἡνιγμένων ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ, μᾶλλον ὁ Κικέρων ἔδεισε, καὶ τεθωρακισμένον αὐτὸν οἷ τε δυνατοὶ πάντες ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας καὶ τῶν νέων πολλοὶ κατήγαγον εἰς τὸ πεδῖον. Τοῦ δὲ θώρακος ἐπίτηδες ὑπέφαινε τι παραλύσας ἐκ τῶν ὤμων τοῦ χιτῶνος, ἐνδεικνύμενος τοῖς ὁρώσι τὸν κίνδυνον. Οἱ δ’ ἠγανάκτουν καὶ συνεστρέφοντο περὶ αὐτόν· καὶ τέλος ἐν ταῖς ψήφοις τὸν μὲν Κατιλίαν αὖθις ἐξέβαλον, εἶλοντο δὲ Σιλανὸν ὕπατον καὶ Μουρήναν.<sup>3</sup>

38. XV. Οὐ πολλῷ δ’ ὕστερον τούτων ἤδη τῷ Κατιλίᾳ τῶν ἐν Τυρρηνίᾳ συνερχομένων καὶ καταλοχιζομένων καὶ τῆς ὥρισμένης πρὸς τὴν ἐπίθεσιν ἡμέρας ἐγγὺς οὔσης, ἦκον ἐπὶ τὴν Κικέρωνος οἰκίαν περὶ μέσας νύκτας ἄνδρες οἱ πρῶτοι καὶ δυνατώτατοι Ῥωμαίων, Μάρκος τε Κράσσος καὶ Μάρκος Μάρκελλος καὶ Σκηπίων Μέτελλος· κόψαντες δὲ τὰς θύρας καὶ καλέσαντες τὸν θυρώρον ἐκέλευον ἐπεγεῖραι καὶ φράσαι Κικέρωνι τὴν παρουσίαν αὐτῶν. Ἦν δὲ τοιόνδε.<sup>4</sup> τῷ Κράσσῳ μετὰ δεῦπνον ἐπιστολὰς ἀποδίδωσιν ὁ θυρωρός, ὑπὸ δὲ τίνος ἀνθρώπου κομισθεῖσας ἀγνώστου, ἀλλὰς ἄλλοις ἐπιγεγραμμένας, αὐτῷ δὲ Κράσσῳ μίαν ἀδέσποτον. Ἦν μόνῃ ἀναγνούς ὁ Κράσσος, ὥς ἔφραζε τὰ γράμματα φόνον γενησόμενον πολλὴν διὰ Κατιλίαν καὶ παρῆναι τῆς πόλεως ὑπέξελθεῖν, τὰς ἄλλας οὐκ ἔλυσεν, ἀλλ’ ἦκεν εὐθὺς πρὸς τὸν Κικέρωνα πληγεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ δεινοῦ καὶ τι τῆς αἰτίας ἀπολνόμενος, ἣν ἔσχε διὰ φιλίαν τοῦ Κατιλίου. Βουλευσάμενος οὖν ὁ Κικέρων ἅμ’ ἡμέρᾳ βουλὴν συνήγαγε, καὶ τὰς ἐπιστολὰς κομίσας ἀπέδωκεν οἷς ἦσαν ἐπεσταλμένοι, κελεύσας φανερώς ἀναγνῶναι. Πᾶσαι δ’ ἦσαν ὁμοίως ἐπιβουλὴν φράζουσαι.

<sup>1</sup> = novarum rerum cupidi. See p. 37.

<sup>2</sup> (A) Cic. *pro Mur.* 25, 51 ff. duo corpora esse rei publicae: unum debile infirmo capite, alterum firmum sine capite; huic si ita de se meritum esset, caput se vivo non defuturum.

<sup>3</sup> (A) Cic. *l.c.*; *pro Sull.* 18, 51; Sall. *c.* 26 (very brief); Dio XXXVII, 29, 3, τοὺς τε ἐπιτηδέους συνεπήγαγε παρεσκευασμένους ἀμύναι οἱ . . . καὶ θώρακα . . . ὑπὸ μὲν τὴν ἐσθῆτα, παραφαίνων δὲ αὐτὸν ἐξεπίτηδες, ἐνεδύσατο . . . ὅτε δῆμος δεινῶς ἠγανάκτησε . . . καὶ οὕτως ὕπατοί τε ἕτεροί τε ἠρέθησαν.

<sup>4</sup> (D) Sall. *c.* 48 knows nothing of this nocturnal visit, but mentions the name of the informer (Tarquinius), and is at pains to exculpate Crassus of any complicity in the plot.



Ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ Κόιντος Ἀρριος,<sup>1</sup> ἀνὴρ στρατηγικός, ἀπήγγελλε τοὺς ἐν Τυρρηνίᾳ καταλοχισμούς, καὶ Μάλλιος ἀπηγγέλλετο σὺν χειρὶ μεγάλῃ περὶ τὰς πόλεις ἐκείνας αἰωρούμενος δεῖ τι προσδοκᾶν καιρὸν ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥώμης, γίνεται δόγμα τῆς βουλῆς παρακατατίθεσθαι τοῖς ὑπάτοις τὰ πράγματα, δεξαμένους δ' ἐκείνους ὡς ἐπίστανται διοικεῖν καὶ σώζειν τὴν πόλιν. Τοῦτο δ' οὐ πολλάκις, ἀλλ' ὅταν τι μέγα δέισις, ποιεῖν εἴωθεν ἡ σύγκλητος.<sup>2</sup>

XVI. Ἐπεὶ δὲ ταύτην λαβὼν τὴν ἐξουσίαν ὁ Κικέρων τὰ μὲν ἐξω πράγματα Κοίντῳ Μετέλλῳ διεπίστευσε, τὴν δὲ πόλιν εἶχε διὰ χειρὸς<sup>3</sup> καὶ καθ' ἡμέραν προΐει δορυφορούμενος ὑπ' ἀνδρῶν τοσούτων τὸ πλῆθος, ὥστε τῆς ἀγορᾶς πολὺ μέρος κατέχειν ἐμβάλλοντος αὐτοῦ τοὺς παραπέμποντας, οὐκ ἐκί καρτερῶν τὴν μέλλησιν ὁ Κατιλίνας αὐτὸς μὲν ἐκπηδᾶν ἔγνω πρὸς τὸν Μάλλιον ἐπὶ τὸ στράτευμα, Μάρκιον δὲ καὶ Κέθηγον<sup>4</sup> ἐκέλευσε ξίφῃ λαβόντας ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὰς θύρας ἔωθεν ὡς ἀσπασομένους τὸν Κικέρωνα καὶ διαχρήσασθαι προσπεσόντας. Τοῦτο Φουλβία,<sup>5</sup> γυνὴ τῶν ἐπιφανῶν, ἐξαγγέλλει τῷ Κικέρωνι, νυκτὸς ἐλθοῦσα καὶ διακελευσαμένη φυλάττεσθαι τοὺς περὶ τὸν Κέθηγον. Οἱ δ' ἦγον ἅμ' ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ κωλυθέντες εἰσελθεῖν ἡγανάκτουν καὶ κατεβόων ἐπὶ θύραις, ὥστε ὑποπτότεροι γενέσθαι.

Προελθὼν δ' ὁ Κικέρων ἐκάλει τὴν σύγκλητον εἰς τὸ τοῦ Στησίου Διὸς ἱερόν, ὃν Στάτορα Ῥωμαῖοι καλοῦσιν, ἰδρυνόμενον ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς ἱερᾶς ὁδοῦ πρὸς τὸ Παλάτιον ἀνιόντων. Ἐνταῦθα καὶ τοῦ Κατιλίνα μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἐλθόντος ὡς ἀπολογησομένου, συγκαθίσαι μὲν οὐδεὶς ὑπέμεινε τῶν συγκλητικῶν,<sup>6</sup> ἀλλὰ πάντες ἀπὸ τοῦ βάθρου μετήλθον. Ἀρξάμενος δὲ λέγειν ἐθουρβεῖτο, καὶ τέλος ἀναστὰς ὁ Κικέρων προσέταξεν αὐτῷ<sup>in Cat. I (Nov. 8)</sup> τῆς πόλεως ἀπαλλάττεσθαι.<sup>7</sup> δεῖν γὰρ αὐτοῦ μὲν λόγους, ἐκείνου δ'

<sup>1</sup> According to \*Sall. c. 30 L. Saenius, a senator, gave this information. The chronological sequence of events in Sallust and Plutarch is also different. Cp. Sibinga l.c. 97-112.

<sup>2</sup> (A) Cic. *in Cat.* I. 2, 4; Sall. c. 29; Dio XXXVII. 31, 2; Liv. Perioch. 109; Caes. *B. C.* I. 5.

<sup>3</sup> (A) Cic. *ad fam.* V. 2, 1, mihi tecum ita dispertitum officium fuisse in rei publicae salute retinenda, ut ego urbem a domesticis insidiis . . . tu Italiam et ab armatis hostibus et ab occulta coniuratione defenderes.

(D) \*Sall. c. 30; App. *B. C.* II. 3.

<sup>4</sup> (D) \*Cic. *in Cat.* I. 4, 9; *pro Sull.* 6, 18, 19, 53; Sall. c. 28; App. *B. C.* II. 3; Dio XXXVII. 32.

<sup>5</sup> (D) \*Cic. *in Cat.* l.c.; Sall. l.c.; App. l.c.

<sup>6</sup> (A) *in Cat.* I. 7, 16; II. 6, 12; Sall. c. 31 C. dissimulandi causa aut sui expurgandi . . . in senatum venit etc.

<sup>7</sup> (A) *in Cat.* I. 5, 10, 9, 23; II. 1, 1; III. 1, 3; *in Pis.* 2, 5; but Dio XXXVII. 33 ἡ γερουσία τὸν Κ. μεταστῆναι ἐψηφίσατο.

Nov. 9 ὅπλοις πολιτευομένου μέσον εἶναι τὸ τεῖχος.<sup>1</sup> Ὁ μὲν οὖν Κατιλίνας εὐθὺς ἐξελθὼν μετὰ τριακοσίων ὀπλοφόρων<sup>2</sup> καὶ περιστησάμενος αὐτῷ βραβδουχίας ὡς ἄρχοντι καὶ πελέκεις καὶ σημαίας ἐπαράμενος πρὸς τὸν Μάλλιον ἐχώρει.<sup>3</sup> καὶ δις μυρίων ὁμοῦ τι συνηθροισμένων ἐπήει τὰς πόλεις ἀναπειθὼν καὶ ἀφιστάς, ὥστε τοῦ πολέμου φανεροῦ γεγονότος τὸν Ἀντώνιον ἀποσταλῆναι διαμαχομένον.<sup>4</sup>

XVII. Τοὺς δ' ὑπολειφθέντας ἐν τῇ πόλει τῶν διεφθαρμένων ὑπὸ τοῦ Κατιλίνα συνῆγε καὶ παρεθάρρυνε Κορνήλιος Λέντλος Σούρας ἐπικλησιν, ἀνὴρ γένους μὲν ἐνδόξου, βεβιωκὼς δὲ φαύλως καὶ δι' ἀσέλγειαν ἐξεληλαμένος τῆς βουλῆς πρότερον, τότε δὲ στρατηγῶν τὸ δεύτερον, ὡς ἔθος ἐστὶ τοῖς ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς ἀνακτωμένοις τὸ βουλευτικὸν ἀξίωμα.

39. Λέγεται δὲ καὶ τὴν ἐπικλησιν αὐτῷ γενέσθαι τὸν Σούραν ἐξ αἰτίας τοιαύτης. Ἐν τοῖς κατὰ Σύλλαν χρόνοις ταμιεύων συχνὰ τῶν δημοσίων χρημάτων ἀπώλεσε καὶ διέφθειρεν. Ἀγανακτοῦντος δὲ τοῦ Σύλλα καὶ λόγον ἀπαιτοῦντος ἐν τῇ συγκλήτῳ, προελθὼν ὀλιγώρως πάνυ καὶ καταφρονητικῶς λόγον μὲν οὐκ ἔφη διδόναι, παρέχειν δὲ τὴν κνήμην, ὥσπερ εἰώθεισαν οἱ παῖδες, ὅταν ἐν τῷ σφαιρίζειν ἀμάρτωσιν. Ἐκ τούτου Σούρας παρωνομάσθη.<sup>5</sup> σούραν γὰρ οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι τὴν κνήμην λέγουσι.

Πάλιν δὲ δίκην ἔχων καὶ διαφθείρας ἐνίους τῶν δικαστῶν, ἐπεὶ δυσὶ μόνας ἀπέφυγε ψήφοις, ἔφη παρανάλωμα γεγονέναι τὸ θατέρῳ κριτῇ δοθέν· ἀρκεῖν γὰρ εἰ καὶ μιᾷ ψήφῳ μόνον ἀπελύθη.

Τούτων ὄντα τῇ φύσει τοιοῦτον κεινημένον ὑπὸ τοῦ Κατιλίνα προσδιέφθειραν ἐλπίσι κεναῖς ψευδομάντεις καὶ γόητες ἔπη πεπλασμένα καὶ χρησμοὺς ᾄδοντες, ὡς ἐκ τῶν Σιβυλλείων<sup>6</sup> προδηλοῦντας εἰμαρμένους εἶναι τῇ Ῥώμῃ Κορνηλίους τρεῖς μονάρχους, ὧν δύο μὲν ἤδη πεπληρωμένα τὸ χρεών, Κίνναν τε καὶ Σύλλαν, τρίτῳ δὲ λοιπῷ Κορνηλίῳ ἐκείνῳ φέροντα τὴν μοναρχίαν ἵκειν τὸν δαίμονα, καὶ δεῖν πάντως δέχεσθαι καὶ μὴ διαφθεῖρην μέλλοντα τοὺς καιροὺς ὥσπερ Κατιλίνας.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> in *Cat.* I. 5, 10, magno me metu liberabis, dummodo inter me atque te murus intersit (and similarly in *Cat.* I. 7, 16); but the antithesis (λόγοις . . . ὅπλοις) is not found in the Ciceronian passages.

<sup>2</sup> \* (D) in *Cat.* II. 2, 4, parum comitatus; 12, 27; Sall. c. 32, cum paucis. Plutarch throughout identifies the first and second Catilinian speeches!

<sup>3</sup> (A) App. B. C. II. 3; Dio XXXVII. 33.

<sup>4</sup> (A) Cic. *pro Mur.* 39, 84; in *Cat.* II. 5, 11; Sall. c. 36; Dio XXXVII. 33, 3.

<sup>5</sup> The apocryphal character of the story is made evident by the fact that the name *Sura* occurs much earlier, e.g. Liv. XXII. 31 (217 B.C.).

<sup>6</sup> The same oracle is recorded in Cic. in *Cat.* III. 4, 9; Sall. c. 47; Liv. Perioch. 102; Vell. Pat. II. 34; App. B. C. II. 2; Florus IV. 1, 8, and alluded to by Dio XXXVII. 34.

<sup>7</sup> Perhaps a reference to the first Catilinian conspiracy.

40. XVIII. Οὐδὲν οὖν ἐπενόει μικρὸν ὁ Λέντλος ἢ ἄσημον, ἀλλ' ἐδέδοκτο τὴν βουλὴν ἅπασαν ἀναιρεῖν τῶν τ' ἄλλων πολιτῶν ὅσους δύναίτο, τὴν πόλιν δ' αὐτὴν καταπιμπράναι, φεῖδεσθαί τε μηδενὸς ἢ τῶν Πομπηίου τέκνων· ταῦτα δ' ἐξαρπασμένους ἔχειν ὑφ' αὐτοῖς καὶ φυλάττειν ὁμηρα τῶν πρὸς Πομπηίου διαλύσεων· ἤδη γὰρ ἐφοῖτα πολὺς λόγος καὶ βέβαιος ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ κατιόντος ἀπὸ τῆς μεγάλης στρατείας.<sup>1</sup> Καὶ νῦν μὲν ὤριστο πρὸς τὴν ἐπίθεσιν μία τῶν Κρονιαδῶν,<sup>2</sup> ξίφη δὲ καὶ Dec. 198. στυππεῖα καὶ θεῖον εἰς τὴν Κεθήγου φέροντες οἰκίαν ἀπέκρυσαν.<sup>3</sup> Ἄνδρας δὲ τάξαντες ἑκατὸν καὶ μέρη τοσαῦτα τῆς Ῥώμης ἕκαστον ἐφ' ἐκάστῳ διεκλήρωσαν,<sup>4</sup> ὥς δι' ὀλίγου πολλῶν ἀψάντων φλέγοιτο πανταχόθεν ἡ πόλις. Ἄλλοι δὲ τοὺς ὀχετοὺς ἐμελλον ἐμφράξαντες ἀποσφάττειν τοὺς ὑδρευομένους.<sup>5</sup>

Πραττομένων δὲ τούτων ἔτυχον ἐπιδημοῦντες Ἀλλοβρίγων<sup>6</sup> δύο<sup>7</sup> πρέσβεις, ἔθρους μάλιστα δὴ τότε πονηρὰ πράττοντος καὶ βαρυνομένου τὴν ἡγεμονίαν. Τούτους οἱ περὶ Λέντλον ὠφελίμους ἡγούμενοι πρὸς τὸ κινήσαι καὶ μεταβαλεῖν τὴν Γαλατίαν ἐποιήσαντο συνωμότης.<sup>8</sup> Καὶ γράμματα μὲν αὐτοῖς πρὸς τὴν ἐκεῖ βουλὴν, γράμματα δὲ πρὸς Κατιλίαν ἔδωκαν,<sup>9</sup> τῇ μὲν ὑπισχνούμενοι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν,<sup>10</sup> τὸν δὲ Κατιλίαν παρακαλοῦντες ἐλευθερώσαντα τοὺς δούλους ἐπὶ τὴν Ῥώμην ἐλαύνειν.<sup>11</sup> Συν-ἀπέστελλον δὲ μετ' αὐτῶν πρὸς τὸν Κατιλίαν Τίτον τινὰ Κροτωνιάτην

<sup>1</sup> Cf. § 35<sup>2</sup>. This statement is also found only here. Both passages point to an authority very friendly to Pompey as the *ultimate* source of the narrative, possibly Livy.

<sup>2</sup> \* (D) Cic. *in Cat.* III. 4, 10, Lentulo et aliis Saturnalibus caedem fieri atque urbem incendi placeret, Cethego nimium id longum videretur; 7, 17.

<sup>3</sup> \* (D) *in Cat.* III. 5, 10, Cethegus qui paulo ante aliquid tamen de *gladiis* et *sicis* quae apud ipsum erant deprehensa, respondisset . . . se semper bonorum ferramentorum studiosum fuisse; 3, 8. There is nothing corresponding to this in Sall.

<sup>4</sup> (D) \* *in Cat.* I. 4, 9; III. 4, 8, 6, 14; *pro Sull.* 18, 52 f.; Sall. 43; App. *B. C.* II. 3; Dio XXXVII. 34, 1, καταπρήσαι τε τὸ ἄστυ (a corrupt passage).

<sup>5</sup> This detail is found only here.

<sup>6</sup> The Allobrogian incident is related by Cic. *in Cat.* III. 2, 4-5, 13; Sall. c. 40-47; App. *B. C.* II. 4. The coincidences are mostly quite unavoidable, and, in any case, completely neutralized by divergences in details.

<sup>7</sup> Their number is not elsewhere recorded.

<sup>8</sup> (A) Cic. *Cat.* III. 2, 4; Sall. c. 40 is very circumstantial, but the revolt of Gaul is not a part of the plan.

<sup>9</sup> Cic. l.c., but not in Sallust.

<sup>10</sup> (D) No such promise is mentioned by Cic. or Sall., but perhaps implied *in Cat.* III. 9, 22.

<sup>11</sup> (D) Cic. l.c. III. 4, 8, se habere ad Catilinam mandata et litteras, ut *servorum praesidio uteretur*, ut ad urbem . . . cum exercitu accederet. This



κομίζοντα τὰς ἐπιστολάς.<sup>1</sup> Οἷα δ' ἀνθρώπων ἀσταθμῆτων καὶ μετ' οἶνον τὰ πολλὰ καὶ γυναικῶν ἀλλήλοις ἐντυγχανόντων βουλευματα πόνῳ καὶ λογισμῷ νήφοντι καὶ συνέσει περιττῇ διώκων ὁ Κικέρων, καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν ἔχων ἔξωθεν ἐπισκοποῦντας τὰ πραττόμενα καὶ συνεξιχνεύοντας αὐτῷ, πολλοὺς δὲ τῶν μετέχειν δοκούντων τῆς συνωμοσίας διαλεγόμενος κρύφα καὶ πιστευόν, ἔγνω τὴν πρὸς τοὺς ξένους κοινολογίαν.<sup>2</sup> καὶ νυκτὸς ἐνεδρεύσας ἔλαβε τὸν Κροτωνιάτην καὶ τὰ γράμματα συνεργούντων ἀδήλως τῶν Ἀλλοβρίγων.

Dec. 3

XIX. Ἄμα δ' ἡμέρᾳ βουλὴν ἀθροίσας εἰς τὸ τῆς Ὀμονοίας ἱερὸν ἐξανέγνω τὰ γράμματα καὶ τῶν μηνυτῶν διήκουσεν.<sup>3</sup> Ἐφη δὲ καὶ Σιλανὸς Ἰούνιος ἀκηκοέναι τινὰς Κεθήγου λέγοντος, ὡς ὑπατοί τε τρεῖς καὶ στρατηγοὶ τέτταρες ἀναιρεῖσθαι μέλλουσι.<sup>4</sup> Τοιαῦτα δ' ἔτερα καὶ Πείσων, ἀνὴρ ὑπατικός, εἰσήγγειλε.<sup>4</sup> Γάιος δὲ Σουλπίκιος, εἰς τῶν στρατηγῶν, ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν πεμφθεὶς τοῦ Κεθήγου πολλὰ μὲν ἐν αὐτῇ βέλη καὶ ὅπλα, πλείστα δὲ ξίφη καὶ μαχαίρας εὗρε νεοθήκτους ἀπάσας.<sup>5</sup> Τέλος δὲ τῷ Κροτωνιάτῃ ψηφισαμένης ἀδειαν ἐπὶ μηνύσει τῆς βουλῆς ἐξελεγχθεὶς ὁ Λέντλος ἀπωμόσατο τὴν ἀρχήν (στρατηγῶν γὰρ ἐτύγχανε), καὶ τὴν περιπόρφυρον ἐν τῇ βουλῇ καταθέμενος διήλλαξεν ἐσθῆτα τῇ συμφορᾷ πρέπουσαν.<sup>6</sup> Οὗτος μὲν οὖν καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ παρεδόθησαν εἰς ἀδεσμον φυλακὴν τοῖς στρατηγοῖς.<sup>7</sup>

In Cat.

III

(Dec. 3)

41. Ἦδη δ' ἐσπέρas οὔσης καὶ τοῦ δήμου περιμένοντος ἀθρόου, προσελθὼν ὁ Κικέρων, καὶ φράσας τὸ πρᾶγμα τοῖς πολίταις καὶ προπεμφθεῖς, παρήλθεν εἰς οἰκίαν φίλου γειννῶντος,<sup>8</sup>

is followed by details which Plut. had given earlier (§ 39 oracle, § 40 burning of the city), Lentulus being there represented as acting independently. In Cic. and Sall. c. 44 these facts are stated as the confession of Volturcius, in Plut. the latter's evidence is associated only with the exposure of Lentulus.

<sup>1</sup> \* (D) Cic. l.c. *T. Volturcius*; Sallust: *T. Volturcium quendam Crotoniensem*; Appian: Βουλτούρκιον ἄνδρα Κροτωνιάτην; Florus: Volturcius. The name given by Plut. is, therefore, not based upon Cic. or Sallust.

<sup>2</sup> \* (D) This is also completely at variance with Cic. l.c. and Sall. c. 41 (and Appian). According to the latter, moreover, the ambassadors reveal the plot to Q. Fabius Sanga, who in turn informs Cicero, but Sanga is not mentioned either in Cic. or in Plutarch.

<sup>3</sup> (D) According to Cic. *Cat.* III. 3, 7, he opened the letters in the presence of witnesses *before* submitting them to the Senate.

<sup>4</sup> These details are not mentioned elsewhere.

<sup>5</sup> \* Agrees with Cic. *Cat.* III. 3, 6, 5, 10 except as to the νεοθήκτους ἀπάσας.

<sup>6</sup> (D) See p. 22.

<sup>7</sup> (D) \* Sall. c. 47 Lentulus itemque ceteri in liberis custodiis habeantur. Five custodians are mentioned, but there is no praetor among them!

<sup>8</sup> This fact is not elsewhere mentioned.

42. ἐπεὶ τὴν ἐκείνου γυναῖκες κατεῖχον ἱεροῖς ἀπορρήτοις ὀργιάζουσαι θεόν, ἣν Ῥωμαῖοι μὲν ἀγαθὴν, Ἕλληνες δὲ Γυναικεῖαν ὀνομάζουσι. Θύεται<sup>1</sup> δ' αὐτῇ κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ ὑπάτου διὰ γυναικὸς ἢ μητρὸς αὐτοῦ, τῶν Ἑστιάδων παρθένων παρουσῶν. Εἰσελθὼν οὖν ὁ Κικέρων κατ' αὐτόν, ὀλίγων παντάπασιν αὐτῷ παρόντων, ἐφρόντιζεν ὅπως χρῆσαιτο τοῖς ἀνδράσι. Τὴν τε γὰρ ἄκραν καὶ προσήκουσαν ἀδικήμασι τηλικούτοις τιμωρίαν ἐξευλαβεῖτο καὶ κατώκει δι' ἐπιείκειαν ἥθους ἅμα καὶ ὥς μὴ δοκοῖη τῆς ἐξουσίας ἄγαν ἐμφορεῖσθαι καὶ πικρῶς ἐπεμβάινειν ἀνδράσι γένει τε πρώτοις καὶ φίλους δυνατοῦς ἐν τῇ πόλει κεκτημένοις· μυλακώτερόν τε χρυσάμενος ὠρρώδει τὸν ἀπ' αὐτῶν κίνδυνον. Οὐ γὰρ ἀγαπήσειν μετριώτερόν τι θανάτου παθόντας, ἀλλ' εἰς ἅπαν ἀναρραγήσεσθαι τόλμης τῇ παλαιᾷ κακίᾳ νέαν ὀργὴν προσλαβόντας· αὐτὸς τε δόξειν ἀνάνδρος καὶ μαλακός, οὐδ' ἄλλως δοκῶν εὐτολμότατος εἶναι τοῖς πολλοῖς.

XX. Ταῦτα τοῦ Κικέρωνος διαποροῦντος γίνεται τι ταῖς γυναῖξι σημεῖον θυούσαις. Ὁ γὰρ βωμός, ἥδη τοῦ πυρὸς κατακεκοιμῆσθαι δοκοῦντος, ἐκ τῆς τέφρας καὶ τῶν κεκαυμένων φλοιῶν φλόγα πολλὴν ἀνῆκε καὶ λαμπράν. Ὑφ' ἧς αἱ μὲν ἄλλαι διεπτοήθησαν, αἱ δ' ἱεραὶ παρθένοι τὴν τοῦ Κικέρωνος γυναῖκα Τερεντίαν ἐκέλευσαν ἢ τάχος χωρεῖν πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα καὶ κελεύειν οἷς ἔγνωκεν ἐγχειρεῖν ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος, ὥς μέγα πρὸς τε σωτηρίαν καὶ δόξαν αὐτῷ τῆς θεοῦ φῶς διδούσης.

43. Ἡ δὲ Τερεντία (καὶ γὰρ οὐδ' ἄλλως ἦν πραγὰ τις οὐδ' ἄτολμος τὴν φύσιν, ἀλλὰ φιλότιμος γυνὴ καὶ μᾶλλον, ὥς αὐτὸς φησιν ὁ Κικέρων,<sup>2</sup> τῶν πολιτικῶν μεταλαμβάνουσα παρ' ἐκείνου φροντίδων ἢ μεταδιδούσα τῶν οἰκιακῶν ἐκείνῳ) ταῦτά τε πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔφρασε καὶ παρώξυνεν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> On this prodigy and the deliberations of Cicero, see p. 18. The latter are attributed to him by Sall. c. 46 on the *eve of the exposure*, and he ignores the alleged portent: *anxius erat, dubitans, in maximo scelere tantis civibus deprehensis, quid facto opus esset; poenam illorum sibi oneri, impunitatem perdundae rei publicae fore credebat. Igitur confirmato animo vocari ad sese iubet Lentulum etc.* Sallust does not state the reason for this 'confirmatio animi.' Did he perhaps have in mind the alleged omen? If so, his well-known radical views on the subject of prodigia might have been the cause for not mentioning it.

<sup>2</sup> Wherever this remark may have been made, it cannot have occurred in the *ὑπόμνημα τῆς ὑπατείας* for the reasons given on p. 19 f. Hence the *entire* story cannot have been taken by Plut. from this source.

<sup>3</sup> (D) On the other hand, Cicero (*in Cat.* IV. 2, 3) says she was *exanimata*.

44. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Κόϊντος ὁ ἀδελφὸς<sup>1</sup> καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ φιλοσοφίας ἐταίρων Πόπλιος Νιγίδιος,<sup>2</sup> ᾧ τὰ πλείστα καὶ μέγιστα παρὰ τὰς πολιτικὰς ἐχρήτο πράξεις.

Dec. 5

45. Τῇ δ' ὑστεραίᾳ γενομένων ἐν συγκλήτῳ λόγων περὶ τιμωρίας τῶν ἀνδρῶν,<sup>3</sup> ὁ πρῶτος ἐρωτηθεὶς γνώμην Σιλανὸς εἶπε τὴν ἐσχάτην δίκην δοῦναι προσήκειν ἀχθέντας εἰς τὸ δεσμωτήριον. Καὶ προσετίθεντο τοῦτ' πάντες ἐφεξῆς μέχρι<sup>4</sup> Γαίου Καίσαρος τοῦ μετὰ ταῦτα δικτάτορος γενομένου.

46. Τότε δὲ νέος ὢν ἔτι καὶ τὰς πρώτας ἔχων τῆς αὐξήσεως ἀρχάς, ἥδη δὲ τῇ πολιτείᾳ καὶ ταῖς ἐλπίσιν εἰς ἐκείνην τὴν ὁδὸν ἐμβεβηκώς, ἡ τὰ Ῥωμαίων εἰς μοναρχίαν μετέστησε πράγματα, τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους ἐλάνθανε,<sup>5</sup> τῷ δὲ Κικέρωνι πολλὰς μὲν ὑποψίας,<sup>6</sup> λαβὴν δ' οὐδεμίαν εἰς ἔλεγχον παρέδωκεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ λεγόντων ἦν ἐνίων ἀκούειν, ὥς ἐγγὺς ἐλθὼν ἄλωνα διεκφύγοι τὸν ἄνδρα. Τινὲς δὲ φασὶ<sup>7</sup> παριδεῖν ἐκόντα καὶ παραλιπεῖν τὴν κατ' ἐκείνου μήνυσιν φόβῳ τῶν φίλων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς δυνάμεως· παντὶ γὰρ εἶναι πρόδηλον, ὅτι μᾶλλον ἢ ἐκείνοι γένοιτο προσθήκη Καίσαρι σωτηρίας ἢ Καῖσαρ ἐκείνοις κολάσεως.

47. XXI. Ἐπεὶ δ' οὖν ἡ γνώμη περιήλθεν εἰς αὐτόν, ἀναστὰς ἀπεφώνητο μὴ θανατοῦν τοὺς ἄνδρας, ἀλλὰ τὰς οὐσίας εἶναι δημοσίας, αὐτοὺς δ' ἀπαχθέντας εἰς πόλεις τῆς Ἰταλίας, ἃς ἂν δοκῇ Κικέρωνι,<sup>8</sup> τηρεῖσθαι δεδεμένους, ἄχρι ἂν οὗ καταπολεμηθῇ Κατιλίνας.<sup>9</sup> Οὐσῆς δὲ

<sup>1</sup> This is not confirmed by any extant utterances of Cicero and may have been based upon the *de petitione consulatus*.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Plut. *An seni sit ger.* 27 Κικέρων αὐτὸς ὡμολόγει τὰ κάλλιστα καὶ μέγιστα τῶν συμβουλευμάτων οἷς ὀρθῶς ἐνυπατεύων τὴν πατρίδα διέσωζε μετὰ Ποπλίου Νιγιδίου τοῦ φιλοσόφου συνθεῖναι. This exaggerated eulogy of one of Cicero's collaborators in crushing the conspiracy is quite un-Ciceronian. Cp. *ad fam.* (ad Nigidium) IV. 13, 2, per me quondam te socio defensa res publica. The second-hand character of the passage seems indicated by the *imperfect*.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. Cic. *in Cat.* IV; Sall. c. 50-52; Vell. Pat. II. 35, 1; Plut. *Cat. Min.* 22; App. *B. C.* II. 5 f.; Dio XXXVII. 35 f.; Florus IV. 1, 10.

<sup>4</sup> Cp. p. 23.

<sup>5</sup> Cp. Suet. *Caes.* 9, Cicero in quadam ad Axium epistola referens, Caesarem in consulatu confirmasse regnum de quo aedilis cogitavit.

<sup>6</sup> Sall. c. 49 defends Cæsar against the charge. It is repeated by Plut. *Crass.* 15; and Suet. *Caes.* 9 (the first conspiracy). 14. <sup>7</sup> (A) Plut. *Caes.* 7.

<sup>8</sup> This is not expressly mentioned in Cic. or Sall. but in App. *B. C.* II. 6. On the other hand, they record some parts of Cæsar's motion not found in Plutarch.

<sup>9</sup> (A) App. *B. C.* II. 6 μέχρι Κατιλίνα καταπολεμηθέντος.

(D) Cic. *Cat.* IV vincula . . . et ea sempiterna etc.; Sall. c. 51 in vinculis habendos per municipia quae maxime opibus valent, neu quis de his postea ad senatum referat etc.



τῆς γνώμης ἐπεικοῦς καὶ τοῦ λέγοντος εἰπὼν δυνατωτάτου, ῥοπήν ὁ Κικέρων προσέθηκεν οὐ μικράν. Αὐτός τε γὰρ ἀνιστὰς ἐνεχείρησεν εἰς ἑκάτερον, τὰ μὲν τῇ προτέρῃ, τὰ δὲ τῇ γνώμῃ Καίσαρος συνειπών, οἱ τε φίλοι πάντες οἰόμενοι τῷ Κικέρωνι συμφέρειν τὴν Καίσαρος γνώμην (ἦττον γὰρ ἐν αἰτίαις ἔσεσθαι μὴ θανατώσαντα τοὺς ἄνδρας) ἤρουντο τὴν δειντέραν μᾶλλον γνώμην,<sup>1</sup> ὥστε καὶ τὸν Σιλανὸν αὖθις μεταβαλλόμενον παραιτεῖσθαι καὶ λέγειν, ὡς οὐδ' αὐτὸς εἶποι θανατικὴν γνώμην· ἐσχάτην γὰρ ἀνδρὶ βουλευτῇ Ῥωμαίῳ εἶναι δίκην τὸ δεσμωτήριον.<sup>2</sup> Εἰρημένης δὲ τῆς γνώμης πρῶτος ἀντέκρουσεν αὐτῇ Κάτλος Λουτάτιος.<sup>3</sup> εἶτα δεξάμενος Κάτων, καὶ τῷ λόγῳ σφοδρῶς συνεπερείσας ἐπὶ τὸν Καίσαρα τὴν ὑπόνοιαν,<sup>4</sup> ἐνέπλησε θυμοῦ καὶ φρονήματος τὴν σύγκλητον, ὥστε θάνατον καταψηφίσασθαι τῶν ἀνδρῶν.<sup>5</sup>

in Cat.  
IV  
(Lec 8)

48. Περὶ δὲ δημεύσεως χρημάτων ἐνίστατο Καίσαρ, οὐκ ἀξίῳ τὰ φιλάνθρωπα τῆς ἐαυτοῦ γνώμης ἐκβαλόντας ἐνὶ χρήσασθαι τῷ σκυνθρωποτάτῳ. Βιαζομένων δὲ πολλῶν ἐπεκαλεῖτο τοὺς δημάρχους. Οἱ δ' οὐχ ὑπήκουον, ἀλλὰ Κικέρων αὐτὸς ἐνδοὺς ἀνῆκε τὴν περὶ δημεύσεως γνώμην.<sup>6</sup>

49. XXII. Ἐχώρει δὲ μετὰ τῆς βουλῆς ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας. Οὐκ ἐν ταύτῳ δὲ πάντες ἦσαν, ἄλλος δ' ἄλλον ἐφύλαττε τῶν στρατηγῶν.<sup>7</sup> Καὶ πρῶτον ἐκ Παλατίου παραλαβὼν τὸν Λέντλον ἤγε<sup>8</sup> διὰ τῆς ἱερᾶς ὁδοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀγορᾶς μέσης, τῶν μὲν ἡγεμονικωτάτων ἀνδρῶν κύκλῳ περιεσπειραμένων καὶ δορυφορούντων,<sup>8</sup> τοῦ δὲ δήμου φρίττοντος τὰ δρώμενα καὶ παριόντος σιωπῇ, μάλιστα δὲ τῶν νέων, ὥσπερ ἱεροῖς τισι πατρίοις ἀριστοκρατικῆς τινος ἐξουσίας τελείσθαι μετὰ φόβον καὶ θάμβους δοκούντων. Διελθὼν δὲ τὴν ἀγορὰν καὶ γενόμενος πρὸς τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ

<sup>1</sup> (D) This passage shows that Plut. never read the 4th Catilinian.

<sup>2</sup> As the original could have left no doubt as to his meaning (cp. Sall. c. 51), this quibble cannot be authentic. It is again mentioned in Plut. *Cat. Min.* 22 and in Suet. *Caes.* 14, tantum metum iniecit asperiora suadentibus . . . ut Decimum Silanum . . . non piguerit sententiam suam . . . interpretatione lenire velut gravius atque ipse sensisset exceptam. Here, as in § 46<sup>5</sup>, Plutarch and Suetonius are the *only* authorities for these details. According to Sall. c. 50, Silanus merely changed his vote per motus oratione C. Caesaris.

<sup>3</sup> He is mentioned at the head of a long list of men who advocated the death penalty before Cato. Cp. Cic. *ad Att.* XII. 21, 1.

<sup>4</sup> So App. *B. C.* l.c. σαφῶς ἀνακαλύπτων τὴν ἐς τὸν Καίσαρα ὑπόψιν.

<sup>5</sup> Cp. *ad Att.* l.c.; Sall. c. 53; Suet. *Caes.* 14.

<sup>6</sup> This incident is related only in Plutarch.

<sup>7</sup> The same error as in § 40<sup>7</sup>, p. 82. Sall. c. 55 says that the condemned conspirators, with the exception of Lentulus, were taken to prison *per praetores*, but App. *B. C.* II. 6 ἕκαστον αὐτῶν ὁ Κικέρων ἐς τὸ δεσμωτήριον μεταγαγών.

<sup>8</sup> Sall. l.c. ipse, praesidiis dispositis, in carcerem deducit.

παρέδωκε τὸν Λέντλον τῷ δημῷ καὶ προσέταξεν ἀνελεῖν· εἴθ' ἐξῆς τὸν Κέθηγον, καὶ οὕτω τῶν ἄλλων ἕκαστον καταγαγὼν ἀπέκτεινεν.

Ὅρων δὲ πολλοὺς ἔτι τῆς συνωμοσίας ἐν ἀγορᾷ συνεστῶτας ἀθρόους καὶ τὴν μὲν πρᾶξιν ἀγνοοῦντας, τὴν δὲ νύκτα προσμένοντας, ὥς ἔτι ζώντων τῶν ἀνδρῶν καὶ δυναμένων ἐξαρπασθῆναι, φθεγξάμενος μέγα πρὸς αὐτοὺς “Ἐξῆσαν” εἶπεν.<sup>1</sup> Οὕτω δὲ Ῥωμαίων οἱ δυσφημεῖν μὴ βουλόμενοι τὸ τεθνάναι σημαίνουσιν.

\*Ὡδῃ δ' ἦν ἐσπέρα, καὶ δι' ἀγορᾶς ἀνέβαινεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, οὐκέτι σιωπῇ τῶν πολιτῶν οὐδὲ τάξει προπεμπόντων αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ φωναῖς καὶ κρότοις δεχομένων, καθ' οὓς γένοιτο, σωτήρα καὶ κτίστην ἀνακαλούντων τῆς πατρίδος.<sup>2</sup> Τὰ δὲ φῶτα πολλὰ κατέλαμπε τοὺς στενωπούς, λαμπάδια καὶ δᾶδας ἰστώντων ἐπὶ ταῖς θύραις. Αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες ἐκ τῶν τεγῶν προῦφαινον ἐπὶ τιμῇ καὶ θέᾳ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ὑπὸ πομπῇ τῶν ἀρίστων μάλα σεμνῶς ἀνιόντος· ὧν οἱ πλείστοι πολέμους τε κατεργασμένοι μεγάλους καὶ διὰ θριάμβων εἰσεληλακότες καὶ προσκεκτημένοι γῆν καὶ θάλαπταν οὐκ ὀλίγην ἐβάδιζον ἀνομολογούμενοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους, πολλοῖς μὲν τῶν τότε ἡγεμόνων καὶ στρατηγῶν πλούτου καὶ λαφύρων καὶ δυνάμεως χάριν ὀφείλουν τὸν Ῥωμαίων δῆμον, ἀσφαλείας δὲ καὶ σωτηρίας ἐνὶ μόνῳ Κικέρωνι, τηλικούτον ἀφελόντι καὶ τοσοῦτον αὐτοῦ κίνδυνον.<sup>3</sup> Οὐ γὰρ τὸ κωλύσαι τὰ πρᾶττόμενα καὶ κολάσαι τοὺς πράττοντας ἐδόκει θαυμαστόν, ἀλλ' ὅτι μέγιστον τῶν πώποτε νεωτερισμῶν οὗτος ἐλαχίστοις κακοῖς ἄνεν στάσεως καὶ ταραχῆς κατέσβεσε.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This graphic description is unquestionably of one piece and hence necessarily taken from one and the same authority, highly favorable to Cicero. But that this source was the *ὑπόμνημα*, as is universally assumed, is refuted by *ἔξῆσαν*, which clearly proves that Plutarch read the word *vixerunt* in a Latin narrative, in which he must also have found the explanation of the euphemism. That Appian, though he exhibits many noteworthy coincidences with Plutarch in these particular chapters, did not consult this biography or a common third source, is made evident by the words: τοῖς ἐν ἀγορᾷ παροδεύων ἐσήμηνεν, *ὅτι τεθνᾶσιν*.

<sup>2</sup> *ad Att.* IX. 10, 3, me quem nonnulli conservatorem istius urbis, quem parentem esse dixerunt; *Iuv.* VIII. 243 Roma parentem, Roma patrem patriae Ciceronem libera dixit; *App. B. C.* II. 7 ἐπὶ ἔργῳ διὰ στόματος ἦν καὶ σωτὴρ ἐδόκει περιφανῶς ἀπολλυμένη τῇ πατρίδι γενέσθαι, χάριτές τε ἦσαν αὐτῷ παρὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ εὐφημία ποικίλαι.

<sup>3</sup> *Esp. in Cat.* IV. 10, 21, sit Scipio ille clarus . . . Paullus . . . Marius . . . Pompeius . . . erit inter horum laudes aliquid loci nostrae gloriae etc.

<sup>4</sup> *E.g. Cic. in Cat.* III. 10, 23, erepti estis ex crudelissimo . . . interitu, erepti sine caede, sine sanguine, sine exercitu, sine dimicatione, togati me uno togato duce et imperatore vicistis. 6, 15; *pro Flacco* 40, 102; *Phil.* XIV. 8, 24.

50. Καὶ γὰρ τὸν Κατιλίαν οἱ πλεῖστοι τῶν συνερρηκόντων πρὸς αὐτὸν ἅμα τῷ πυθέσθαι τὰ περὶ Λέντλον καὶ Κέθηγον ἐγκαταλιπόντες ᾤχοντο.<sup>1</sup> καὶ μετὰ τῶν συμμεμενηκότων αὐτῷ διαγωνισάμενος πρὸς Ἀντώνιον αὐτὸς τε διεφθάρη καὶ τὸ στρατόπεδον.<sup>2</sup>

51. XXIII. Οὐ μὴν ἀλλ' ἦσαν οἱ τὸν Κικέρωνα παρεσκευασμένοι καὶ λέγειν ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ ποιεῖν κακῶς, ἔχοντες ἡγεμόνας τῶν εἰς τὸ μέλλον ἀρχόντων Καῖσαρα μὲν στρατηγοῦντα, Μέτελλον δὲ καὶ Βηστιάν δημαρχοῦντας.<sup>3</sup> Οἱ τὴν ἀρχὴν παραλαβόντες, ἔτι τοῦ Κικέρωνος ἡμέρας ὀλίγας ἀρχοντας, οὐκ εἶων δημηγορεῖν αὐτόν, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐμβόλων βάρβα θίντες οὐ παρέισαν οὐδ' ἐπέτρεπον λέγειν, ἀλλ' ἐκέλευον, εἰ βούλοιο, μόνον περὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀπομόσαντα καταβαίνειν. Κάκεϊνος ἐπὶ τούτοις ὡς ὁμόσων προῆλθε· καὶ γενομένης αὐτῷ σιωπῆς ὤμνουν οὐ τὸν πάτριον, ἀλλ' ἰδιόν τινα καὶ καινὸν ὄρκον, ἧ μὴν σισσωκέναι τὴν πατρίδα καὶ διατετηρηκέναι τὴν ἡγεμονίαν. Ἐπώμνυε δὲ τὸν ὄρκον αὐτῷ σύμπας ὁ δῆμος.<sup>4</sup> Ἐφ' οἷς ἔτι μᾶλλον ὃ τε Καῖσαρ οἱ τε δῆμαρχοι χαλεπαίνοντες ἄλλας τε τῷ Κικέρωνι ταραχὰς ἐμχανῶντο, καὶ νόμος ὑπ' αὐτῶν εἰσήγετο καλεῖν Πομπηῖον μετὰ τῆς στρατιᾶς, ὡς δὴ καταλύσοντα τὴν Κικέρωνος δυναστείαν.<sup>5</sup>

Dec. 29

<sup>1</sup> (A) Sall. c. 57 postquam in castra nuntius pervenit . . . de Lentulo et Cethego ceterisque . . . supplicium sumptum, plerique quos ad bellum spes rapinarum aut novarum rerum studium illexerat, dilabuntur. Dio Cass. XXXVII. 39 ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐκείνων τε ἀπολωλότα ἐπύθετο καὶ τῶν συνόντων οἱ συχνοὺς μεθισταμένους διὰ τοῦτ' ἔσθετο etc.

<sup>2</sup> Sall. c. 57-61; App. B. C. II. 7; Dio Cass. XXXVII. 39.

<sup>3</sup> (A) *pro Sestio* 5, 11, tribunorum plebis novorum, qui tum extremis diebus consulatus mei res eas quas gesseram vexare cupiebant, and Schol. Bob. ad loc.

(D) Sall. c. 43 correctly speaks of the opposition of Bestia at an earlier period: L. Bestia, tribunus plebis, contione habita, quereretur de actionibus Ciceronis etc. The two tribunes for 62 were Metellus and Cato (see below). Bestia was tribune in 63, and had nothing to do with the incident of the oath.

(A) *ad fam.* V. 2, 6, quem (sc. Metellum) ego cum comperissem omnem sui tribunatus conatum in meam perniciem parare atque meditari.

<sup>4</sup> *ad fam.* V. 2, 7, cum ille (Metellus) mihi nihil, nisi ut iurarem, permetteret, magna voce iuravi verissimum pulcherrimumque iusiurandum quod populus item magna voce me vere iurasse iuravit; in *Pis.* 3, 6, cum in contione abiens magistratu dicere a tribuno pl. prohiberer quae constitueram, cumque is mihi tantum modo ut iurarem permetteret, sine ulla dubitatione iuravi rem publicam atque hanc urbem mea unius opera esse salvam, populus Romanus . . . meum iusiurandum . . . approbavit; *de rep.* I. 4, 7; Dio XXXVII. 38, 1.

<sup>5</sup> Plut. *Cat. Min.* 26 f. This law is not mentioned elsewhere, nor do we hear of Cæsar's opposition to Cicero at this time (cf. Dio XXXVII. 11), but cp. *pro Sull.* 7, 21, hic ait se ille regnum meum ferre non posse . . . consulatus,



Ἄλλ' ἦν ὄφελος μέγα τῷ Κικέρωνι καὶ πάσῃ τῇ πόλει δημαρχῶν τότε Κάτων καὶ τοῖς ἐκείνων πολιτεύμασιν ἀπ' ἴσης μὲν ἐξουσίας, μείζονος δὲ δόξης ἀντιστασόμενος. Τά τε γὰρ ἄλλα ῥιδίδως ἔλυσε, καὶ τὴν Κικέρωνος ὑπατείαν οὕτως ἦρε τῷ λόγῳ μεγάλην δημηγορήσας, ὥστε τιμὰς αὐτῷ τῶν πώποτε μεγίστας ψηφίσασθαι<sup>1</sup> καὶ προσαγορεύσαι πατέρα πατρίδος. Πρώτῳ γὰρ ἐκείνῳ δοκεῖ τοῦτο καθυπάρξει, Κάτωνος αὐτὸν οὕτως ἐν τῷ δήμῳ προσαγορεύσαντος.<sup>2</sup>

52. XXIV. Καὶ μέγιστον μὲν ἴσχυσεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τότε, πολλοὺς δ' ἐπίφθονον ἑαυτὸν ἐποίησεν ἀπ' οὐδενὸς ἔργου πονηροῦ, τῷ δ' ἐπαινεῖν αἰεὶ καὶ μεγαλύνειν αὐτὸς ἑαυτὸν ὑπὸ πολλῶν δυσχεραίνόμενος. Οὐτε γὰρ βουλὴν οὔτε δήμον οὔτε δικαστήριον ἦν συνελθεῖν, ἐν ᾧ μὴ Κατιλίναν ἔδει θρυλούμενον ἀκοῦσαι καὶ Λέντλον.<sup>3</sup>

Ἄλλὰ καὶ τὰ βιβλία τελευτῶν κατέπλησε καὶ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν ἐγκωμίων<sup>4</sup> καὶ τὸν λόγον ἡδιστον ὄντα καὶ χάριν ἔχοντα πλείστην ἐπαχθῇ καὶ φορτικὸν ἐποίησε τοῖς ἀκροωμένοις,<sup>5</sup> ὥσπερ τινὸς αἰεὶ κηρὸς αὐτῷ τῆς ἀηδίας ταύτης προσούσης.

Ὅμως δέ, καίπερ οὕτως ἀκράτῳ φιλοτιμίᾳ συνών, ἀπήλλακτο τοῦ φθονεῖν ἑτέροις,<sup>6</sup> ἀφθονώτατος ὢν ἐν τῷ τοὺς πρὸ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς καθ'

credo, mei etc.; in *Vat.* 9, 23, qui nos . . . tyrannos vocas; ad *Att.* I. 16, 10, quousque, inquit (sc. Clodius), hunc regem feremus? in *Cat.* I. 9, 22. 11, 28.

<sup>1</sup> *ad fam.* (ad Catonem) XV. 4, 11.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. § 49<sup>2</sup>; Plin. *N. H.* VII. 30, 31, Salve (M. Tulli) primus omnium parens patriae appellate. App. *B. C.* II. 7, Κάτωνος δ' αὐτὸν καὶ πατέρα τῆς πατρίδος προσαγορεύσαντος, ἐπεβόησεν ὁ δῆμος. καὶ δοκεῖ τισιν ἥδε ἡ εὐφημία ἀπὸ Κικέρωνος ἀρξαμένη. According to Cic. *pro Sest.* 57, 121; in *Pis.* 3, 6, *Q. Catulus* bestowed the title upon him in the *senate*. He nowhere mentions Cato in connection with it, nor does he say that he was the first who was so honored. In *pro Rab.* 10, 27 it is applied to Marius, by *Liv.* I. 16 to Romulus, V. 49 to Camillus.

<sup>3</sup> (A) Brut. *ad Att.* I. 17, 1, non omnibus horis iactamus Idus Martias, similiter atque ille Nonas Decembres suas in ore habet; \* *Sen. de brev. vit.* 5, 1; Dio Cass. XXXVII. 38; XXXVIII. 12.

<sup>4</sup> (A) See p. 39 and e.g. *pro Sull.* 9, 26. 11, 33. 29, 82; in *Pis.* 1, 3. 3, 7; *Phil.* II. 5, 11; *pro Flacco* 40, 102; in *Cat.* III. 11, 26; IV. 10, 20 ff.; ad *Att.* I. 19, 6; *de dom.* 35, 93.

<sup>5</sup> (A) Schol. Bob. *pro Planc.* p. 270 epistolam non mediocrem ad instar voluminis scriptam quam Pompeio in Asiam de rebus suis in consulatu gestis miserat Cicero, aliquanto, ut videbatur, insolentius scriptam ut Pompei stomachum non mediocriter commoveret quod quadam superbiore iactantia omnibus se gloriosis ducibus anteponeret.

<sup>6</sup> (A) Cic. *Phil.* X. 1, 1, declarasti . . . quod ego semper sensi neminem alterius qui suae confideret, virtuti invidere.

(D) Tac. *Dial.* 25 et ipsum Ciceronem credo solitos et invidere et livore . . . adfici.

αὐτὸν ἄνδρας ἐγκωμιάζειν, ὡς ἐκ τῶν συγγραμμάτων λαβεῖν ἔστι. Πολλὰ δ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπομνημονεύουσιν· οἷον περὶ Ἀριστοτέλους, ὅτι χρυσίου ποταμὸς εἴη ρέοντος,<sup>1</sup> καὶ περὶ τῶν Πλάτωνος διαλόγων, ὡς τοῦ Διός, εἰ λόγῳ χρῆσθαι πέφυκεν, οὕτω διαλεγομένου.<sup>2</sup> Τὸν δὲ Θεόφραστον εἰώθει τρυφὴν ἰδίαν ἀποκαλεῖν.<sup>3</sup> Περὶ δὲ τῶν Δημοσθένους λόγων ἐρωτηθεὶς, τίνα δοκοῖ καλλίστον εἶναι, τὸν μέγιστον εἶπε.<sup>4</sup> Καίτοι τινὲς τῶν προσποιουμένων δημοσθενίζειν ἐπιφύονται φωνῇ τοῦ Κικέρωνος, ἣν πρὸς τινα τῶν ἐταίρων ἔθηκεν ἐν ἐπιστολῇ γράψας, ἐνιαχοῦ τῶν λόγων ἀπονυστάζειν τὸν Δημοσθένη.<sup>5</sup> τῶν δὲ μεγάλων καὶ θαυμαστῶν ἐπαίνων, οἷς πολλαχοῦ<sup>6</sup> χρῆται περὶ τοῦ ἀνδρός, καὶ ὅτι περὶ οὓς μάλιστα τῶν ἰδίων ἐσπούδασε λόγων, τοὺς κατ' Ἀντωνίου, Φιλίππικους ἐπέγραψεν, ἀμνημονοῦσι.

Τῶν δὲ κατ' αὐτὸν ἐνδόξων ἀπὸ λόγου καὶ σοφίας οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδεὶς, ὃν οὐκ ἐποίησεν ἐνδοξότερον ἢ λέγων ἢ γράφων εὐμενῶς περὶ ἐκάστου.

Κρατίπῳ δὲ τῷ Περιπατητικῷ διεπράξατο μὲν Ῥωμαίῳ γενέσθαι παρὰ Καίσαρος ἄρχοντος ἡδῇ, διεπράξατο δὲ τὴν ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλὴν ψηφίσασθαι καὶ δεθῆναι μένειν αὐτὸν ἐν Ἀθήναις καὶ διαλέγεσθαι τοῖς νέοις ὡς κοσμοῦντα τὴν πόλιν.

45-44  
B.C.

Ἐπιστολαὶ δὲ παρὰ τοῦ Κικέρωνος εἰςὶ πρὸς Ἡρώδην, ἕτεραι δὲ πρὸς τὸν υἱόν,<sup>7</sup> ἐγκελευομένου συμφιλοσοφεῖν Κρατίπῳ.

Γοργίαν δὲ τὸν ῥήτορα αἰτιώμενος εἰς ἡδονὰς καὶ πότους προάγει τὸ μειράκιον ἀπελαίνει τῆς συνουσίας αὐτοῦ.<sup>8</sup>

Καὶ σχεδὸν αὕτη τε τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν μία καὶ δευτέρα πρὸς Πέλοπα τὸν Βυζάντιον ἐν ὀργῇ τιμὴ γέγραπται, τὸν μὲν Γοργίαν<sup>8</sup> αὐτοῦ προσηκόντως ἐπικόπτοντος, εἴπερ ἦν φαῦλος καὶ ἀκόλαστος, ἥπερ ἔδοκει, πρὸς δὲ τὸν Πέλοπα μικρολογουμένου καὶ μεμψιμοιροῦντος

<sup>1</sup> (A) Cic. *Acad. Prior* II. 38, 119, veniet flumen orationis aureum fundens Aristoteles.

<sup>2</sup> (A) Cic. *Brut.* 31, 121, Iovem sic, aiunt philosophi, si Graece loquatur, loqui.

<sup>3</sup> Not found among the extant references to Theophrastus in Cicero.

<sup>4</sup> (D) Plin. *Epist.* I. 20 applies this to Cicero himself: cuius oratio optima fertur esse quae maxima.

<sup>5</sup> Cp. p. 40 and Quint. XII. 1, 22, neque ipsi Ciceroni D. videtur satis esse perfectus quem dormire interdum dicit; Cic. *Orat.* 29, 104, ut usque eo . . . morosi simus ut nobis non satisfaciat ipse Demosthenes.

<sup>6</sup> E.g. *Brut.* 9, 36. 37. 84; *Orat.* 2. 7. 26. 31. 70; *de opt. gen.* 2. 5; *Tusc. Disp.* V. 36; *ad Att.* XV. 1 b.

<sup>7</sup> (A) Not extant, but cp. *ad fam.* XII. 16 (Trebonius ad Cic.); XVI. 21, 3 ff. (Cic. M. F. ad Tironem).

<sup>8</sup> (A) *ad fam.* XVI. 21, 6, omnia postposui, dummodo praeceptis patris parerem, διαρρήδην enim scripserat, ut eum dimitterem statim.

ὥσπερ ἀμελήσαντα τιμάς τινας αὐτῷ καὶ ψηφίσματα παρὰ Βυζαντίων γενέσθαι.

XXV. Ταῦτά τε δὴ φιλότιμα, καὶ τὸ πολλάκις ἐπαιρόμενον τοῦ λόγου τῇ δεινότητι τὸ πρόπον προίεσθαι.

53. Μουνατίῳ μὲν γάρ ποτε συνηγορήσας, ὡς ἀποφυγὼν τὴν δίκην ἐκείνος ἐδίδωκεν ἐταῖρον αὐτοῦ Σαβίνον, οὕτω λέγεται προπεσεῖν ὑπ' ὀργῆς ὁ Κικέρων, ὥστ' εἰπεῖν. "Σὺ γὰρ ἐκείνην, ὦ Μουνάτιε, τὴν δίκην ἀπέφυγες διὰ σταντόν, οὐκ ἐμοῦ πολὺ σκότος ἐν φωτὶ τῷ δικαστηρίῳ περιχέαντος;"<sup>1</sup>

Μάρκον δὲ Κράσσον ἐγκωμιάζων ἀπὸ τοῦ βήματος εὐημέρησε, καὶ μεθ' ἡμέρας αἵτις ὀλίγας λαιδορῶν αὐτόν, ὡς ἐκείνος εἶπεν, "Οὐ γὰρ ἐνταῦθα πρῶν αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς ἐπήνευ;" "Ναί," φησι, "μελέτης ἔνεκεν γυμνάζων τὸν λόγον εἰς φάυλην ὑπόθεσιν."

Εἰπόντος δὲ ποτε τοῦ Κράσσου μηδένα Κράσσον ἐν Ῥώμῃ βεβιωκέναι μακρότερον ἐξηκονταετίας, εἶθ' ὕστερον ἀρνούμενον καὶ λέγοντος, "Τί δ' ἂν ἐγὼ παθὼν τοῦτ' εἶπον;" "Ἥιδεις," ἔφη, "Ῥωμαίους ἡδέως ἀκουσομένους καὶ διὰ τοῦτ' ἐδωμαγωγείς."

Ἀρέσκεσθαι δὲ τοῦ Κράσσου τοῖς Στωϊκοῖς φήσαντος, ὅτι πλούσιον εἶναι τὸν ἀγαθὸν ἀποφαίνουσιν, "Ὅρα, μὴ μᾶλλον," εἶπεν, "ὅτι πάντα τοῦ σοφοῦ λέγουσιν εἶναι." Διεβάλλετο δ' εἰς φιλαργυρίαν ὁ Κράσσος.

Ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῦ Κράσσου τῶν παίδων ὁ ἕτερος Ἀξίῳ τινὶ δοκῶν ὅμοιος εἶναι καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τῇ μητρὶ προστριβόμενος αἰσχροῦ ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀξίῳ διαβολὴν εὐδοκίμησε λόγον ἐν βουλῇ διελθὼν, ἐρωτηθεὶς ὁ Κικέρων, τί φαίνεται [αὐτῷ,] "Ἀξίος," εἶπε, "Κράσσον."

XXVI. Μέλλων δὲ Κράσσος εἰς Συρίαν ἀπαίρειν ἐβούλετο τὸν Κικέρωνα μᾶλλον αὐτῷ φίλον ἢ ἐχθρὸν εἶναι· καὶ φιλοφρονούμενος ἔφη βούλεσθαι δειπνήσαι παρ' αὐτῷ· κακείνος ὑπεδέξατο προθύμως. Ὀλίγαις δ' ὕστερον ἡμέραις περὶ Βατινίου φίλων τινῶν ἐντυγχανόντων ὡς μνωμένον διαλύσεις καὶ φιλίαν (ἦν γὰρ ἐχθρός), "Οὐ δῆπου καὶ Βατίγιος," εἶπε, "δειπνήσαι παρ' ἐμοὶ βούλεται;" Πρὸς μὲν οὖν Κράσσον τοιοῦτος.<sup>2</sup>

Αὐτὸν δὲ τὸν Βατινίου ἐχοντα χοιράδας ἐν τῷ τραχήλῳ καὶ λέγοντα δίκην οἰδοῦντα ῥήτορα προσεῖπεν.<sup>3</sup> Ἀκούσας δ' ὅτι τέθνηκεν, εἶτα

<sup>1</sup> (D) Quint. II. 17, Cicero se tenebras offudisse *in causa Cluentii* gloriatus est. Such divergences (see below p. 91<sup>2</sup>), the vagueness of *ἐν τινὶ δίκῃ* (three times), the censorious object which these witticisms are made to subserve (§ 54), and the fact that not one of them is found in Cicero's extant writings, seem to me to preclude Tiro's *de iocis Ciceronis* as Plutarch's source for c. 25-27. Cp. p. 35<sup>21</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> On Cicero's relations to Crassus and Vatinius see *ad fam.* I. 9, 19 f. V. 19 f.

<sup>3</sup> (A) See above § 32.



μετὰ μικρὸν πυθόμενος σαφῶς, ὅτι ζῇ. “Κακὸς τοίνυν ἀπόλοιτο κακῶς ὁ ψευσάμενος.”

Ἐπεὶ δὲ Καίσαρι ψηφισαμένῳ τὴν ἐν Καμπανίᾳ χώραν κατανεμηθῆναι τοῖς στρατιώταις πολλοὶ μὲν ἐδυσχέρανον ἐν τῇ βουλῇ, Λεύκιος δὲ Γέλλιος ὁμοῦ τι πρεσβύτατος ὢν εἶπεν, ὡς οὐ γενήσεται τοῦτο ζῶντος αὐτοῦ, “Περιμένωμεν,” εἶπεν ὁ Κικέρων, “μακρὰν γὰρ οὐκ αἰτεῖται Γέλλιος ὑπέρθεσιν.”<sup>1</sup>

Ἦν δέ τις Ὀκταυῖος αἰτίαν ἔχων ἐκ Λιβύης γεγονέναι· πρὸς τοῦτον ἐν τινι δίκῃ λέγοντα τοῦ Κικέρωνος μὴ ἐξακούειν, “Καὶ μὴν οὐκ ἔχεις,” εἶπε, “τὸ οὖς ἀτρύπητον.”<sup>2</sup>

Μετέλλου δὲ Νέπωτος εἰπόντος, ὅτι πλείονας καταμαρτυρῶν ἀνῆρκεν ἢ συνηγορῶν σέσωκεν, “Ὁμολογῶ γάρ,” ἔφη, “πίστεως ἐν ἐμοὶ πλέον ἢ δεινότητος εἶναι.”

Νεανίσκου δὲ τινος αἰτίαν ἔχοντος ἐν πλακοῦντι φάρμακον τῷ πατρὶ δεδωκέναι θρασυνομένον καὶ λέγοντος, ὅτι λοιδορήσει τὸν Κικέρωνα, “Τοῦτο,” ἔφη, “παρὰ σοῦ βούλομαι μᾶλλον ἢ πλακοῦντα.”

Ποπλίου δὲ Σηστίου συνήγορον μὲν αὐτὸν ἐν τινι δίκῃ παραλαβόντος μεθ’ ἐτέρω, αὐτοῦ δὲ πάντα βουλομένου λέγειν καὶ μηδεὶ παρίεντος εἰπεῖν, ὡς δῆλος ἦν ἀφιέμενος ὑπὸ τῶν δικαστῶν ἤδη τῆς ψήφου φερομένης· “Χρὼ σήμερον,” ἔφη, “τῷ καιρῷ, Σήστιε· μέλλεις γὰρ αὔριον ἰδιώτης εἶναι.”

Πόπλιον δὲ Κώνσταν νομικὸν εἶναι βουλούμενον, ὄντα δ’ ἀμαθῆ καὶ ἀφύῃ, πρὸς τина δίκην ἐκάλεσε μάρτυρα. Τοῦ δὲ μηδὲν εἰδέναι φάσκοντος, “Ἴσως,” ἔφη, “δοκεῖς περὶ τῶν νομικῶν ἐρωτᾶσθαι.”

Μετέλλου δὲ Νέπωτος ἐν διαφορᾷ τινι πολλάκις λέγοντος, “Τίς σοῦ πατήρ ἐστιν;” ὁ Κικέρων, “Σοὶ ταύτην,” ἔφη, “τὴν ἀπόκρισιν ἢ μήτηρ χαλεπώτεραν ἐποίησεν.” Ἐδόκει δ’ ἀκόλαστος ἢ μήτηρ εἶναι τοῦ Νέπωτος, αὐτὸς δὲ τις εὐμετάβολος.

Καί ποτε τὴν δημαρχίαν ἀπολιπὼν ἄφνω πρὸς Πομπηίου ἐξέπλευσεν εἰς Συρίαν, εἰτ’ ἐκεῖθεν ἐπανήλθεν ἀλογώτερον. Θάψας δὲ Φίλαγρον<sup>3</sup> τὸν καθηγητὴν ἐπιμελέστερον ἐπέστησεν αὐτοῦ τῷ τάφῳ κόρακα λίθινον. Καὶ ὁ Κικέρων “Τοῦτ’,” ἔφη, “σοφώτερον ἐποίησας· πέτεσθαι γάρ σε μᾶλλον ἢ λέγειν ἐδίδαξεν.”

Ἐπεὶ δὲ Μάρκος Ἀππίος ἐν τινι δίκῃ προοιμιαζόμενος εἶπε φίλον αὐτοῦ δεδεῆσθαι παρασχεῖν ἐπιμέλειαν καὶ λογιότητα καὶ πίστιν, “Εἶθ’ οὕτως,” ἔφη, “σιδηροῦς γέγονας ἄνθρωπος, ὥστε μηδὲν ἐκ τοσούτων ὢν ἡτήσατο φίλος παρασχεῖν;”

54. XXVII. Τὸ μὲν οὖν πρὸς ἐχθροὺς ἢ ἀντιδίκους σκώμμασι χρῆσθαι πικροτέροις δοκεῖ ῥητορικὸν εἶναι· τὸ δ’ οἷς ἔτυχε προσκρούειν ἕνεκα τοῦ

<sup>1</sup> For two similar jests of Cicero, cp. Quint. VI. 3, 68. 84.

<sup>2</sup> (A) Macrob. *Satur.* VII. 3, 7; Plut. *Symp.* 2, 4.

<sup>3</sup> In Plut. *Apophth.* 7, Diodotus takes the place of Philagrus.

γελοίου πολὺ συνῆγε μῖσος αὐτῷ. Γράψω δὲ καὶ τούτων ὀλίγα.<sup>1</sup> Μάρκον Ἀκύνιον ἔχοντα δύο γαμβροὺς φυγάδας Ἀδραστον ἐκάλει.

Λευκίου δὲ Κόττα τιμητικὴν ἔχοντος ἀρχήν, φιλονοτάτου δ' ὄντος, ὑπατείαν μετιὼν ὁ Κικέρων ἐδάψησε, καὶ τῶν φίλων κύκλῳ περιστάντων, ὡς ἔπινεν, “Ὁρθῶς φοβεῖσθε,” εἶπε, “μή μοι γένοιτο χαλεπὸς ὁ τιμητῆς ὅτι ὕδωρ πίνω.”

Βωκωνίῳ δ' ἀπαντήσας ἄγοντι μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ τρεῖς ἀμορφοτάτας θυγατέρας ἀνεφθέξατο,

“Φοίβου ποτ' οὐκ ἑώντος ἔσπειρεν τέκνα.”

Μάρκον δὲ Γελλίου δοκοῦντος οὐκ ἐξ ἐλευθέρων γεγονέναι, λαμπρᾷ δὲ τῇ φωνῇ καὶ μεγάλῃ γράμματα πρὸς τὴν σύγκλητον ἐξαναγνόντος, “Μὴ θαυμάζετε,” εἶπε, “καὶ αὐτὸς εἰς ἐστί τῶν ἀναπεφωνηκότων.”

Ἐπεὶ δὲ Φαῦστος ὁ Σύλλα τοῦ μοναρχήσαντος ἐν Ῥώμῃ καὶ πολλοὺς ἐπὶ θανάτῳ προγράψαντος ἐν δανείοις γενόμενος καὶ πολλὰ τῆς οὐσίας διασπαθήσας ἀπάρτιον προέγραψε, ταύτην ἔφη μᾶλλον αὐτῷ τὴν προγραφὴν ἀρέσκειν ἢ τὴν πατρῴαν.

55. XXVIII. Ἐκ τούτων ἐγένετο πολλοῖς ἐπαχθής·

καὶ οἱ μετὰ Κλωδίου συνέστησαν ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἀρχὴν τοιαύτην λαβόντες.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>62 B.C.</sup> Ἦν Κλώδιος ἀνὴρ εὐγενής, τῇ μὲν ἡλικίᾳ νέος, τῷ δὲ φρονήματι θρασὺς καὶ αὐθάδης. Οὗτος<sup>3</sup> ἔρων Πομπηίας τῆς Καίσαρος γυναικὸς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ παρεισήλαθε κρύφα, λαβὼν ἐσθῆτα καὶ σκευὴν ψαλτρίας.<sup>4</sup> ἔθνον γὰρ αἱ γυναῖκες τὴν ἀπόρρητον ἐκείνην καὶ ἀθέατον ἀνδράσι θυσίαν ἐν τῇ τοῦ Καίσαρος οἰκίᾳ, καὶ παρῇν ἀνὴρ οὐδεὶς· ἀλλὰ μειράκιον ὃν ἔτι καὶ μήπω γενειῶν ὁ Κλώδιος ἡλπιζε λήσεσθαι διαδὺς πρὸς τὴν Πομπηίαν μετὰ τῶν γυναικῶν. Ὡς δ' εἰσῆλθε νυκτὸς εἰς οἰκίαν μεγάλην, ἡπορεύτο τῶν διόδων· καὶ πλανώμενον αὐτὸν ἰδοῦσα Αὐρηλίας θεραπαινὶς τῆς Καίσαρος μητρὸς ἤτησεν ὄνομα. Φθέγασθαι δ' ἀναγκασθέντος ἐκείνου καὶ φήσαντος ἀκόλουθον Πομπηίας ζητεῖν Ἀβραν τοῦνομα, συνείσα τὴν φωνὴν οὐ γυναικεῖαν οὔσαν ἀνέκραγε καὶ συνεκάλει τὰς γυναῖκας. Αἱ δ' ἀποκλείσασαί τὰς θύρας καὶ πάντα διερευνώμεναι λαμβάνουσι<sup>5</sup> τὸν Κλώδιον εἰς οἶκημα παιδίσκης,

<sup>1</sup> Some of these jests were probably spurious. Cp. Cic. *ad fam.* VII. 32, 2; IX. 3 ff.

<sup>2</sup> On the Clodian Episode (ch. 28–35) in general, cp. Cic. *ad Att.* I. II; *ad Quint.* I. II; *pro Mil.*, *pro Sestio*, *pro Caelio*, *de domo*, *orat. cum pop. grat.*; Dio Cass. XXXVII. 45 f. 51; XXXVIII. 12–30; XXXIX. 6–12. 19–23. 29–40. 44–57. I note only important divergences or such passages as are peculiar to Plutarch or significant.

<sup>3</sup> *ad Att.* I. 12 f.; *de dom.* 40, 105; *de harusp.* 5, 8; Ascon. *in Mil.* p. 52; Dio XXXVII. 45. For the details Plut. is our only authority.

<sup>4</sup> *pro Sest.* 54, 116, qui in mulierum coetum pro psaltria adducitur.

<sup>5</sup> (D) Contradicted by Cic. *ad Att.* I. 12, 4, per manus servulae servatum et eductum; *de harusp.* 21, 44.

ἢ συνεισῆλθε, καταπεφευγότα. Τοῦ δὲ πράγματος περιβοήτου γενομένου Καῖσάρ τε τὴν Πομπηΐαν ἀφῆκε<sup>1</sup> καὶ . . . δίκην ἀσεβείας ἀπεγράψατο τῷ Κλωδίῳ.

56. XXIX. Κικέρων δ' ἦν μὲν αὐτοῦ φίλος καὶ τῶν περὶ Κατιλίαν παττομένων ἐχρήτο προθυμοτάτῳ συνεργῷ καὶ φύλακι τοῦ σώματος,<sup>2</sup> ἰσχυριζομένου δὲ πρὸς τὸ ἔγκλημα τῷ μηδὲ γεγονέναι κατ' ἐκείνον ἐν Ῥώμῃ τὸν χρόνον, ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς πορρωτάτῳ χωρίοις διατρίβειν, κατεμαρτύρησεν ὡς ἀφιγμένου πρὸς αὐτὸν οἰκαδὲ καὶ διειλεγμένου περὶ τινων· ὅπερ ἦν ἀληθές. Οὐ μὴν ἐδόκει μαρτυρεῖν ὁ Κικέρων διὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὴν αὐτοῦ 81 B.C. γυναικὶ Τερεντίαν ἀπολογούμενος.<sup>3</sup> Ἦν γὰρ αὐτῇ πρὸς τὸν Κλωδίον ἀπέχθει διὰ τὴν ἀδελφὴν τὴν ἐκείνου Κλωδίαν, ὡς τῷ Κικέρωνι βουλομένην γαμηθῆναι καὶ τοῦτο διὰ Κατύλλου<sup>4</sup> τινὸς πράττουσαν, ὅς ἐταῖρος μὲν ἦν καὶ συνήθης ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα Κικέρωνος, αἰὲ δὲ πρὸς τὴν Κλωδίαν φοιτῶν καὶ θεραπεύων ἐγγυὲς οἰκοῦσαν ὑποψίαν τῇ Τερεντίᾳ παρέσχε.<sup>5</sup> Χαλεπὴ δὲ τὸν τρόπον οὔσα καὶ τοῦ Κικέρωνος ἀρχουσα παρώξυνε τῷ Κλωδίῳ συνεπιθίσθαι καὶ καταμαρτυρῆσαι. Κατεμαρτύρουν δὲ τοῦ Κλωδίου πολλοὶ τῶν καλῶν κἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐπιορκίως, ῥηδιουργίας, ὅχλων δεκασμούς, φθορὰς γυναικῶν.

Λεύκουλλος δὲ καὶ θεραπαινίδας παρείχεν, ὡς συγγένοιτο τῇ νεωτάτῃ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὁ Κλωδίος, ὅτε Λευκούλλῳ συνώκει. Πολλὴ δ' ἦν δόξα καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις δυσὶν ἀδελφαῖς πλησιάζειν τὸν Κλωδίον, ὧν Τερτίαν μὲν Μάρκιος ὁ Ῥήξ, Κλωδίαν δὲ Μέτελλος ὁ Κέλερ εἶχεν, ἣν Κοναδραντίαν<sup>6</sup> ἐκάλουν, ὅτι τῶν ἐραστῶν τις αὐτῇ χαλκοῦς ἐμβαλὼν εἰς βαλάντιον ὡς ἀργύριον εἰσέπεμψε· τὸ δὲ λεπτότατον τοῦ χαλκοῦ νομίσματος κοναδραντίαν ἐκάλουν.<sup>6</sup> Ἐπὶ ταύτῃ μάλιστα τῶν ἀδελφῶν κακῶς ἤκουσεν ὁ Κλωδίος.

Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ τότε τοῦ δήμου πρὸς τοὺς καταμαρτυροῦντας αὐτοῦ καὶ συνεστῶτας ἀντιταττομένου φοβηθέντες οἱ δικασταὶ φυλακὴν περιεστήσαντο, καὶ τὰς δέλτους οἱ πλείστοι συγκεχυμένοι τοῖς γράμμασιν ἤνεγκαν.<sup>7</sup> Ὅμως δὲ πλείονες ἔδοξαν οἱ ἀπολύοντες γενέσθαι· καὶ τις ἐλέχθη καὶ δεκασμὸς διελθεῖν.

Ὅθεν ὁ μὲν Κάτλος ἀπαντήσας τοῖς κριταῖς “Ὑμεῖς” εἶπεν “ὡς ἀληθῶς ὑπὲρ ἀσφαλείας ᾗτήσασθε τὴν φυλακὴν, φοβούμενοι μὴ τις ὑμῶν ἀφέληται

<sup>1</sup> See below § 56 ext.

<sup>2</sup> This version is not found elsewhere and probably belongs to the same source as § 43. 86.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. *Am. Jour. of Phil.* XI. 316 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *pro Cael.* 20, 50, obliviscor iam iniurias tuas, Clodia, depono memoriam doloris mei, quae abs te crudeliter in meos me absente facta sunt, negligo.

<sup>5</sup> *pro Cael.* 26, 62, mulier potens quadrantaria.

<sup>6</sup> This chapter from the *chronique scandaleuse* of the day is quite in the manner of Suetonius. The details, as here given, are not found elsewhere, but the charge is confirmed in a general way in many passages, e.g. Cic. *pro Sest.* 7, 15; *pro Caelio* 13, 32 ff.; *de dom.* 34, 92; *pro Mil.* 27, 73; Vell. II. 45, 1.

<sup>7</sup> This fact is also given in Plut. *Caes.* 10.



τὸ ἀργύριον.”<sup>1</sup> Κικέρων δὲ τοῦ Κλωδίου πρὸς αὐτὸν λέγοντος, ὅτι μαρτυρῶν οὐκ ἔσχε πίστιν παρὰ τοῖς δικασταῖς, “Ἀλλ’ ἐμοὶ μὲν,” εἶπεν, “οἱ πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι τῶν δικαστῶν ἐπίστευσαν· τοσοῦτοι γὰρ σου κατεψηφίσαντο· σοὶ δὲ τριᾶκοντα οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν· οὐ γὰρ πρότερον ἀπέλυσαν ἢ ἔλαβον τὸ ἀργύριον.”<sup>2</sup>

Ὁ μέντοι Καῖσαρ οὐ κατεμαρτύρησε κληθεὶς ἐπὶ τὸν Κλωδίον, οὐδ’ ἔφη μοιχείαν κατεγνωκέναι τῆς γυναικός, ἀφεικέναι δ’ αὐτὴν ὅτι τὸν Καῖσαρος ἔδει γάμον οὐ πράξεως αἰσχρᾶς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ φήμης καθαρὸν εἶναι.<sup>3</sup>

59 B.C. 57. XXX. Διαφνῶν δὲ τὸν κίνδυνον ὁ Κλωδῖος καὶ δήμαρχος αἰρεθεὶς εὐθὺς εἶχετο τοῦ Κικέρωνος, πάνθ’ ὁμοῦ πράγματα καὶ πάντας ἀνθρώπους συνάγων καὶ ταρατῶν ἐπ’ αὐτόν. Τὸν τε γὰρ δῆμον ὤκειώσατο νόμοις φιλανθρώποις,<sup>4</sup> καὶ τῶν ὑπάτων ἑκατέρῳ μεγάλας ἐπαρχίας ἐψηφίσαντο, Πείσωνι μὲν Μακεδονίαν, Γαβινίῳ δὲ Συρίαν, πολλοὺς δὲ τῶν ἀπώρων συνέτασεν εἰς τὸ πολίτευμα καὶ δούλους ὥπλισμένους περὶ αὐτὸν εἶχε.

Τῶν δὲ πλείστον δυναμένων τότε τριῶν ἀνδρῶν, Κράσσου μὲν ἄντικρυς Κικέρωνι πολεμοῦντος, Πομπηίου δὲ θρυπτομένου πρὸς ἀμφοτέρους, Καῖσαρος δὲ μέλλοντος εἰς Γαλατίαν ἐξίεναι μετὰ στρατεύματος, ὑπὸ τοῦτον ὑποδὸς ὁ Κικέρων, καίπερ οὐκ ὄντα φίλον, ἀλλ’ ὑποπτον ἐκ τῶν περὶ Κατιλίαν,<sup>5</sup> ἡξίωσε πρεσβευτὴς αὐτῷ συστρατεύειν.<sup>6</sup>

Δεξαμένου δὲ τοῦ Καῖσαρος ὁ Κλωδῖος ὥρῳ ἐκφεύγοντα τὴν δημαρχίαν αὐτοῦ τὸν Κικέρωνα προσεποιεῖτο συμβατικῶς ἔχειν, καὶ τῇ Τερεντίᾳ τὴν

<sup>1</sup> This bon mot of Catulus is also recorded by Cic. *ad Att.* I. 16, 5, quid vos, inquit, praesidium a nobis postulabatis? an ne nummi vobis eriperentur, timebatis? Sen. *Epist.* 97, 5; Dio Cass. XXXVII. 46, 3, τὴν φυλακὴν ἤτησαν οὐχ ἔν’ ἀσφαλῶς τοῦ Κλωδίου καταψηφίσωνται, ἀλλ’ ἔν’ αὐτοὶ τὰ χρήματα ἃ δεωροδοκήκεσαν, διασώσωνται.

<sup>2</sup> Cic. *ad Att.* I. 16, 10, iuranti, inquit, tibi non crediderunt. Mihi vero, inquam, XXV iudices crediderunt, XXXI, quoniam nummos ante acceperant, tibi nihil crediderunt.

<sup>3</sup> Plut. *Caes.* 10; Dio Cass. XXXVII. 45; Suet. *Caes.* 74 testis citatus negavit se quidquam comperisse . . . interrogatusque cur igitur repudiasset uxorem, “Quoniam,” inquit, “meos tam suspicione quam crimine iudico carere oportere.”

<sup>4</sup> Cic. *pro Sest.* 25, 55; *in Pis.* 4, 9 and Ascon. *ad loc.*; Dio XXXVIII. 13.

<sup>5</sup> Esp. *pro Sest.* 12, 27. 17, 39 and schol. Bob. *ad loc.*; Vell. Pat. II. 45, 2, non caruerunt suspicione oppressi Ciceronis Caesar et Pompeius; Dio XXXVIII. 16 f.

<sup>6</sup> (D) Clodius’s sudden change and Terentia’s alleged influence (cp. § 43) are not confirmed by extant sources. Regarding the position of legatus, Plut. is also at variance with the facts, as the offer was made by Caesar: cp. *ad Att.* II. 18, 3, a Caesare valde liberaliter inductor in legationem illam. II. 19, 4, esp. *de prov. cons.* 17, 42, postea me, ut sibi essem legatus, non solum suasit, verum etiam rogavit.

πλείστην ἀντιθεῖς αἰτίαν, ἐκείνου δὲ μέμνημένος ἐπιεικῶς αἰεὶ καὶ λόγους εὐγνώμονας ἐνδιδούς, ὡς ἂν τις οὐ μισῶν οὐδὲ χαλεπαίνων, ἀλλ' ἐγκαλῶν μέτρα καὶ φιλικά, παντάπασιν αὐτοῦ τὸν φόβον ἀνῆκεν, ὥστ' ἀπειπὲν τῷ Καίσαρι τὴν πρεσβεΐαν καὶ πάλιν ἔχουσθαι<sup>1</sup> τῆς πολιτείας. Ἐφ' ᾧ παροξινθεὶς ὁ Καῖσαρ<sup>1</sup> τὸν τε Κλωδίον ἐπέρρωσε καὶ Πομπήϊον ἀπίστρεψε κομιδῇ τοῦ Κικέρωνος, αὐτὸς τε κατεμαρτύρησεν ἐν τῷ δήμῳ μὴ δοκεῖν αὐτῷ<sup>2</sup> καλῶς μηδὲ νομίμως ἄνδρας ἀκρίτους ἀνηρῆσθαι τοὺς περὶ Λέντλον καὶ Κέθηγον.

58. Αὕτη γὰρ ἦν ἡ κατηγορία καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦθ' ὁ Κικέρων ἐκαλεῖτο. Κινδυνεύων οὖν καὶ διωκόμενος<sup>3</sup> ἐσθῆτα μετέλλαξε<sup>3</sup> καὶ κόμης ἀνάπλεως περιῶν ἰκέτευε τὸν δῆμον. Πανταχοῦ δ' ὁ Κλωδίος ἀπήντα κατὰ τοὺς στενωπούς, ἀνθρώπους ἔχων ὑβριστὰς περὶ αὐτὸν καὶ θρασεῖς, οἱ πολλὰ μὲν χλευάζοντες ἀκολάστως εἰς τὴν μεταβολὴν καὶ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ Κικέρωνος, πολλαχοῦ δὲ πληρῶ καὶ λίθοις βάλλοντες ἐνίσταντο ταῖς ἰκεσίαις.<sup>3</sup>

XXXI. Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ τῷ Κικέρωνι πρῶτον μὲν ὀλίγον δεῖν σίμπαν τὸ τῶν ἵππων πλῆθος συμμετέβαλε τὴν ἐσθῆτα, καὶ δυσμυρίων οὐκ ἐλάττους νέων παρηκολούθουν κομῶντες καὶ συνικετεύοντες· ἔπειτα τῆς βουλῆς συνελθούσης, ὅπως ψηφίσαιτο τὸν δῆμον ὡς ἐπὶ πένθεσι μεταβαλεῖν τὰ ἱμάτια, καὶ τῶν ὑπάτων ἐναντιωθέντων, Κλωδίον δὲ σιδηροφορομένον περὶ τὸ βουλευτήριον, ἐξέδραμον οὐκ ὀλίγοι τῶν βουλευτικῶν καταρρηγνύμενοι τοὺς χιτῶνας καὶ βοῶντες.<sup>3</sup>

59. Ὡς δ' ἦν οὕτ' οἶκτος οὔτε τις αἰδῶς πρὸς τὴν ὄψιν, ἀλλ' ἔδει τὸν Κικέρωνα φεύγειν ἢ βίᾳ καὶ σιδήρῳ κριθῆναι πρὸς τὸν Κλωδίον, ἐδεῖτο Πομπήϊον βοηθεῖν ἐπίτηδες ἐκποδῶν γεγονότος καὶ διατρίβοντος ἐν ἀγροῖς περὶ τὸν Ἀλβανόν. Καὶ πρῶτον μὲν ἔπεμψε Πείσωνα τὸν γαμβρὸν δεησόμενον· ἔπειτα καὶ αὐτὸς ἀνέβη. Πυθόμενος δ' ὁ Πομπήϊος οὐχ ὑπέμεινεν εἰς

<sup>1</sup> (A) *ad Att.* IX. 2 b, 1, repudiari se totum, magis etiam quam olim in *Xxviratu* putabit. Ac solet, cum se purgat, in me conferre omnem illorum temporum culpam, ita me sibi fuisse inimicum, ut ne honorem quidem a se accipere vellem; but from *de prov. cons.* l.c. it would seem that Caesar's anger was occasioned by the previous refusal.

<sup>2</sup> (D) This Clodian law did not mention Cicero's name, though it was directed especially against him, nor was Cicero indicted in consequence as would appear from Plut. Cp. e.g. Vell. Pat. II. 45, 1, cuius verbis etsi non nominabatur Cicero, tamen solus petebatur; Dio Cass. XXXVIII. 14, 3, οὐδὲ γὰρ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ εἶχεν (sc. ὁ νόμος), ἔργῳ δὲ ἐπ' αὐτὸν ὅτι μάλιστα συνεγράφετο.

<sup>3</sup> Esp. *pro Sest.* 10 ff.; *post red.* 3, 8, pro me praesente senatus hominumque praeterea viginti milia vestem mutaverunt etc. *de domo* 21, 55 ff.; but certain details in Plut. (*νέων, ἐξέδραμον* etc.) are not given in Cicero or elsewhere. App. B. C. II. 15, though agreeing so often with Plut., must have followed another and rather unfriendly authority: τὸ ἔργον, διὰ τὴν ἀπρέπειαν, ἀπὸ οἴκτου μεταπίπτειν ἐς γέλωτα etc.

ὄψιν ἔλθειν, δεινὴ γὰρ αὐτὸν αἰδῶς εἶχε πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα μεγάλους ἡγωνισμένον ἀγῶνας ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ καὶ πολλὰ πρὸς χάριν ἐκείνῳ πεπολιτευμένον, ἀλλὰ Καίσαρι γαμβρὸς ὢν δεομένην προῦδωκε τὰς παλαιὰς χάριτας καὶ κατὰ θύρας ἄλλας ὑπεξελθὼν ἀπεδίδρασκε τὴν ἔντευξιν. Οὕτω δὴ προδοθεὶς ὁ Κικέρων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ γεγονῶς ἔρημος ἐπὶ τοὺς ὑπάτους κατέφυγε.<sup>1</sup>

Καὶ Γαβίνιος μὲν ἦν χαλεπὸς ἀεὶ, Πείσων<sup>2</sup> δὲ διελέχθη πρῶτον αὐτῷ παραινῶν ἐκστῆναι καὶ ὑποχωρῆσαι τῇ τοῦ Κλωδίου ῥύμῃ καὶ τὴν μεταβολὴν τῶν καιρῶν ἐνεργεῖν καὶ γενέσθαι πάλιν σωτῆρα τῆς πατρίδος ἐν στάσει καὶ κακοῖς δι' ἐκείνον οὔσης.

58 B.C. Τοιαύτης τυχὼν ἀποκρίσεως ὁ Κικέρων ἐβουλεύετο σὺν τοῖς φίλοις· καὶ Λεύκουλλος μὲν ἐκέλευε μένειν ὡς περισσόμενον, ἄλλοι<sup>3</sup> δὲ φεύγειν, ὡς ταχὺ τοῦ δήμου ποθήσοντος αὐτόν, ὅταν ἐμπλησθῇ τῆς Κλωδίου μανίας καὶ ἀπονοίας.<sup>4</sup> Ταῦτ' ἔδοξε Κικέρωνι·

καὶ τὸ μὲν ἄγαλμα τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς, ὃ πολὺν χρόνον ἔχων ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας ἰδρύνον ἐτίμα διαφερόντως, εἰς Καπιτώλιον κομίσας ἀνέθηκεν ἐπιγράψας “Ἀθηνᾶ Ῥώμης φύλακι,”<sup>5</sup> πομποὺς δὲ παρὰ τῶν φίλων λαβὼν περὶ μέσας νύκτας ὑπεξῆλθε τῆς πόλεως καὶ πεζῇ διὰ Λευκανίας ἐπορεύετο λαβέσθαι Σικελίας βουλόμενος.

60. XXXII. ‘Ὡς δ’ ἦν φανερὸς ἤδη πεφευγώς, ἐπῆγαγεν αὐτῷ φυγῆς ψήφον ὁ Κλώδιος, καὶ διάγραμμα προὔθηκεν εἰργεῖν πύργος καὶ ὕδατος<sup>6</sup> τὸν ἄνδρα καὶ μὴ παρέχειν στέγην ἐντὸς μιλιῶν πεντακοσίων<sup>7</sup> Ἰταλίας.

61. Τοῖς μὲν οὖν ἄλλοις ἐλάχιστος ἦν τοῦ διαγράμματος τούτου λόγος αἰδουμένοις τὸν Κικέρωνα, καὶ πᾶσαν ἐνδεικνύμενοι φιλοφροσύνην παρέπεμπον αὐτόν· ἐν δ’ Ἰππωνίῳ, πόλει τῆς Λευκανίας, ἦν Οὐιβῶνα νῦν καλοῦσιν, Οὐίβιος, Σικελὸς ἀνὴρ,<sup>8</sup> ἄλλα τε πολλὰ τῆς Κικέρωνος φιλίας ἀπολελυκώς καὶ γεγονῶς ὑπατεύοντος αὐτοῦ τεκτόνων ἑπαρχος, οἰκία μὲν οὐκ ἐδέξατο, τὸ χωρίον δὲ καταγράψειν ἐπηγγέλλετο, καὶ Γάϊος Οὐεργίλιος ὁ τῆς Σικελίας

<sup>1</sup> (D) These details are not based upon extant utterances in Cicero, or elsewhere, but cp. *ad Att.* II. 20. 21. 24; III. 9, 2; *ad Q. fr.* I. 4, 4; II. 3, 3; *pro Sest.* 17, 39.

<sup>2</sup> (D) This contradicts Cicero's statements. Cp. *in Pis.*, e.g. 5, 12.

<sup>3</sup> Cato and Hortensius. Cp. Dio XXXVIII. 17.

<sup>4</sup> Concerning Cicero's reasons for yielding without a struggle, cp. e.g. *pro Planc.* 35, 86 ff.; *pro Sest.* 20, 45 ff., *servavi igitur rem publicam discessu meo . . . unus bis rem publicam servavi etc.*; *de domo* 36, 96.

<sup>5</sup> Cp. Dio Cass. XLV. 17, τὸ ἄγαλμα τὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς φυλακίδος, ὃ πρὸ τῆς φυγῆς ὁ Κικέρων ἐς τὸ Καπιτώλιον ἀνέτεθε. It was struck by lightning and was restored by a decree of the senate. Cp. Cic. *ad fam.* XII. 25, 1.

<sup>6</sup> Vell. Pat. II. 45, 1, *legem in tribunatu tulit: qui civem Romanum indemnatum interemisset, ei aqua et igni interdiceretur.* <sup>7</sup> (D) \**ad Att.* III. 4, 1.

<sup>8</sup> (D) Cp. p. 43; *ad Att.* III. 2, 1. Büchsen-schütz imagines that Plutarch changed *Sica Viboniensis*, which he found in his Cicero, to Οὐίβιος Σικελὸς ἀνὴρ!



στρατηγὸς ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα Κικέρωνι κεχρημένος ἔγραψεν ἀπέχεσθαι τῆς Σικελίας.<sup>1</sup>

Ἐφ' οἷς ἀθυμήσας ὤρμησεν ἐπὶ Βρεντέσιον, κἀκείθεν εἰς Δυρράχιον ἀνέμψα φορῶ περαιούμενος, ἀντιπνεύσαντος πελαγίου μεθ' ἡμέραν ἐπαλινδρόμησεν, εἰτ' αὐθις ἀνήχθη.

62. Λέγεται δὲ καὶ καταπλεύσαντος εἰς Δυρράχιον αὐτοῦ καὶ μέλλοντος ἀποβυίνειν σεισμόν τε τῆς γῆς καὶ σπασμόν ἅμα γενέσθαι τῆς θαλάττης. Ἀφ' ὧν συνέβαλον οἱ μαντικοὶ μὴ μόνιμον αὐτῷ τὴν φυγὴν ἔσεσθαι· μεταβολῆς γὰρ εἶναι ταῦτα σημεῖα.<sup>2</sup>

Πολλῶν δὲ φοιτώντων ἀνδρῶν ὑπ' εὐνοίας καὶ τῶν Ἑλληνίδων πόλεων διαιμυλωμένων πρὸς αὐτὰς ταῖς πρεσβείαις, ὅμως ἀθυμῶν καὶ περίλυπος διῆγε τὰ πολλά,<sup>3</sup> πρὸς τὴν Ἰταλίαν, ὥσπερ οἱ δυσέρωτες, ἀφορῶν καὶ τῷ φρονήματι μικρὸς ἄγαν καὶ ταπεινὸς ὑπὸ τῆς συμφορᾶς γεγωνὺς καὶ συνεσταλμένος, ὡς οὐκ ἂν τις ἄνδρα παιδεῖ συμβεβιωκότα τοσαύτη προσεδόκησε.

63. Καίτοι πολλάκις αὐτὸς ἡξίον τοὺς φίλους μὴ ῥήτορα καλεῖν αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ φιλόσοφον· φιλοσοφίαν γὰρ ὡς ἔργον ἡρῆσθαι, ῥητορικῇ δ' ὄργανον χρῆσθαι πολιτευόμενος ἐπὶ τὰς χρεῖας. Ἀλλ' ἡ δόξα δεινὴ τὸν λόγον ὥσπερ βαφὴν ἀποκλύσαι τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τὰ τῶν πολλῶν ἐνομόρξασθαι πάθη δι' ὁμιλίαν καὶ συνήθειαν τοῖς πολιτευομένοις, ἂν μὴ τις εἴ μάλᾳ φυλαττόμενος οὕτω συμφέρηται τοῖς ἐκτός, ὡς τῶν πραγμάτων αὐτῶν, οὐ τῶν ἐπὶ τοῖς πράγμασι παθῶν συμμεθέξων.<sup>4</sup>

64. XXXIII. Ὁ δὲ Κλώδιος ἐξελάσας τὸν Κικέρωνα κατέπρησε μὲν αὐτοῦ τὰς ἐπαύλεις, κατέπρησε δὲ τὴν οἰκίαν καὶ τῷ τόπῳ ναὸν Ἐλευθερίας ἐπωκοδόμησε· τὴν δ' ἄλλην οὐσίαν ἐπόλει καὶ διεκρήνυτε καθ' ἡμέραν, μηδὲν ὠνούμενου μηδενός.<sup>5</sup> Ἐκ δὲ τούτου φοβερὸς ὦν τοῖς ἀριστοκρατικοῖς καὶ τὸν δῆμον ἀνειμένον εἰς ὕβριν πολλὴν καὶ θρασύτητα συνεφελκόμενος, ἐπεχείρει τῷ Πομπηίῳ, τῶν διωκμένων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὴν στρατείαν ἔνια σπαράττων. Ἐφ' οἷς ὁ Πομπηῖος ἀδοξῶν ἐκάκιζεν αὐτὸς αὐτὸν προίεμενος τὸν Κικέρωνα· καὶ πάλιν ἐκ μεταβολῆς παντοῖος ἐγένετο πράττων κάθοδον αὐτῷ μετὰ τῶν φίλων. Ἐνισταμένους δὲ τοῦ Κλωδίου συνέδοξε τῇ βουλῇ μηδὲν διὰ μέσου πρᾶγμα κυροῦν μηδὲ πράττειν δημόσιον, εἰ μὴ Κικέρωνι κάθοδος γένοιτο.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> (A) *pro Planc.* 40, 95 ff.; Dio Cass. XXXVIII. 17.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. p. 43.

<sup>3</sup> *ad Att.* III. 8-21. 22, 4.

<sup>4</sup> Cp. the discussion between Cic. and Philiscus in Dio Cass. XXXVIII. 18-29.

<sup>5</sup> E.g. Cic. *de dom.* 24, 62. 41, 108; *ad Att.* IV. 2.

<sup>6</sup> *pro Sest.* 31, 67 f.; *in Pis.* 13, 29; *de dom.* 10, 25 ff.; *pro Mil.* 14, 37 and Ascon. *ad loc.*; Dio Cass. XXXVIII. 30; Plut. *Pomp.* 49.

Τῶν δὲ περὶ Λέντλον ὑπατευνόντων καὶ τῆς στάσεως πρόσω βαδιζούσης, ὥστε τρωθῆναι μὲν ἐν ἀγορᾷ δημάρχους, Κόιντον δὲ τὸν Κικέρωνος ἀδελφὸν ἐν τοῖς νεκροῖς ὡς τεθνηκότα κείμενον διαλαθεῖν,<sup>1</sup>

ὁ τε δῆμος ἤρχετο τρέπεσθαι τῇ γνώμῃ, καὶ τῶν δημάρχων Ἀννιος Μίλων πρῶτος ἐτόλμησε τὸν Κλώδιον εἰς δίκην ἀπάγειν βιαίων, καὶ Πομπηΐω πολλοὶ συνήλθον ἔκ τε τοῦ δήμου καὶ τῶν πέριξ πόλεων. Μεθ' ὧν προελθὼν καὶ τὸν Κλώδιον ἀναστήσας ἔκ τῆς ἀγορᾶς ἐπὶ τὴν ψῆφον ἐκάλει τοὺς πολίτας. Καὶ λέγεται μηδέποτε μηδὲν ἐκ τοσαύτης ὁμοφροσύνης ἐψηφίσασθαι τὸν δῆμον.

57 B.C. Ἡ δὲ σύγκλητος ἀμιλλωμένη πρὸς τὸν δῆμον ἔγραψεν ἐπαινεθῆναι<sup>2</sup> τὰς πόλεις, ὅσαι τὸν Κικέρωνα παρὰ τὴν φυγὴν ἐθεράπευσαν, καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτῷ καὶ τὰς ἐπαύλεις, ἃς Κλώδιος διεφθάρκει,<sup>3</sup> τέλεσι δημοσίοις<sup>4</sup> ἀνασταθῆναι.

Aug. 11.  
57 B.C. Κατ'ἣν δὲ Κικέρων ἐκκαιδεκάτῳ μηνὶ μετὰ τὴν φυγὴν καὶ τοσαύτη τὰς πόλεις χαρὰ καὶ σπουδὴ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους περὶ τὴν ἀπάντησιν εἶχεν, ὥστε τὸ ῥήθην ὑπὸ Κικέρωνος ὕστερον ἐνδεέστερον εἶναι τῆς ἀληθείας. Ἐφ'ἣ γὰρ αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων τὴν Ἰταλίαν φέρουσιν εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην εἰσενεγκεῖν.<sup>5</sup>

Sept. 8.  
57 B.C. Ὅπου καὶ Κράσσος, ἐχθρὸς ὢν αὐτῷ πρὸ τῆς φυγῆς, τότε προθύμως ἀπήντα καὶ διελέετο, τῷ παιδὶ Ποπλίῳ χαριζόμενος, ὡς ἔλεγε, ζηλωτῇ τοῦ Κικέρωνος ὄντι.<sup>6</sup>

65. XXXIV. Χρόνον δ' οὐ πολὺν διαλιπὼν καὶ παραφυλάξας ἀποδημοῦντα τὸν Κλώδιον ἐπῆλθε μετὰ πολλῶν τῷ Καπιτωλίῳ, καὶ τὰς δημαρχικὰς δέλτους, ἐν αἷς ἀναγραφὰι τῶν διωκόμενων ἦσαν, ἀπέσπασε καὶ διέφθειρεν.<sup>7</sup> Ἐγκαλοῦντος δὲ περὶ τοῦτου τοῦ Κλωδίου, τοῦ δὲ Κικέρωνος λέγοντος, ὡς παρὰ νόμους ἐκ πατρικίων εἰς δημαρχίαν παρέλθοι, καὶ κύριον οὐδὲν εἶναι τῶν πεπραγμένων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ,<sup>8</sup> Κάτων ἠγανάκτησε καὶ ἀντεῖπε, τὸν μὲν Κλώδιον οὐκ ἐπαινῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ δυσχεραίνων τοῖς πεπολιτευμένοις, δεινὸν δὲ καὶ βίαιον ἀποφαίνων ἀναίρεσιν ψηφίσασθαι

<sup>1</sup> *pro Sest.* 34, 74 ff. *occidunt nonnullos, vulnerant multos . . . caedem in foro maximam faciunt . . . fratrem meum . . . poscebant . . . seque servorum . . . corporibus obtexit . . . tum . . . corporibus civium Tiberim compleri.* Büchsenst. ad loc., citing only a part of this passage, asserts that ἐν τοῖς νεκροῖς is a mistranslation of *corpora* in the sense of *cadavera*! Plutarch's statement, however, proves that he did not consult this speech, in spite of numerous coincidences.

<sup>2</sup> *pro Sest.* 62, 129 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *ad Att.* IV. 2, 2; Dio XXXIX. 11.

<sup>4</sup> *in Pis.* 22, 52.

<sup>5</sup> *post red.* 15, 39, Italia cuncta paene suis humeris reportavit. [Sall.] *in Cic.* 4, 7.

<sup>6</sup> *ad fam.* V. 8, 4.

<sup>7</sup> Plut. *Cat. Min.* 40; Dio XXXIX. 21-23.

<sup>8</sup> *de dom.* 29, 77, in illa adoptione legitime factum est nihil.

δογμάτων καὶ πράξεων τοσούτων τὴν σύγκλητον, ἐν αἷς εἶναι καὶ τὴν ἐαυτοῦ τῶν περὶ Κύπρον καὶ Βυζάντιον διοικήσιν. Ἐκ τούτου προσέκρουσεν ὁ Κικέρων αὐτῷ πρόσκρουσιν εἰς οὐδέν ἐμφανὲς προελθούσαν, ἀλλ' ὥστε τῇ φιλοφροσύνῃ χρηθῆναι πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀμαυρότερον.

66. XXXV. Μετὰ ταῦτα Κλώδιον μὲν ἀποκτίννυσιν Μίλωνα· καὶ Jan. 20,  
62 B.C. διωκόμενος φόνου Κικέρωνα παρестήσατο συνήγορον.<sup>1</sup> Ἡ δὲ βουλὴ φοβηθεῖσα, μὴ κινδυνεύοντος ἀνδρὸς ἐνδόξου καὶ θνμοειδοῦς τοῦ Μίλωνος ταρμαχὴ γίνηται περὶ τὴν πόλιν, ἐπέτρεψε Πομπηίῳ ταύτην τε καὶ τὰς ἄλλας κρίσεις βραβεύσαι, παρέχοντα τῇ πόλει καὶ τοῖς δικαστηρίοις ἀσφάλειαν. Ἐκείνου δὲ τὴν ἀγορὰν ἔτι νυκτὸς ἀπὸ τῶν ἄκρων περιλαβόντος τοῖς στρατιώταις, ὁ Μίλων τὸν Κικέρωνα δείσας, μὴ πρὸς τὴν ὄψιν ἀθραῖα διαταραχθεὶς χεῖρον διαγωνίσσεται, συνέπεισιν ἐν φορείῳ κομισθέντα πρὸς τὴν ἀγορὰν ἡσυχάζειν, ἄχρι οὗ συνίασιν οἱ κριταὶ καὶ πληροῦται τὸ δικαστήριον.

67. Ὁ δ' οὐ μόνον ἦν, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἐν ὅπλοις ἀθαρσής,<sup>2</sup> ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ λέγειν μετὰ φόβου προσήει, καὶ μόλις ἐπαύσατο παλλόμενος καὶ τρέμων ἐπὶ πολλῶν ἀγώνων ἀκμὴν τοῦ λόγου καὶ κατάστασιν λαβόντος.<sup>3</sup> Λικιννίῳ δὲ Μουρήνῃ φεύγοντι δίκην ὑπὸ Κάτωνος βοηθῶν, καὶ φιλοτιμούμενος Ὀρτήσιον ὑπερβαλεῖν εὐημερήσαντα, μέρος οὐδὲν ἀνεπαύσατο 63 B.C. τῆς νυκτός, ὡς ὑπὸ τοῦ σφόδρα φροντίσαι καὶ διαγρυνήσασθαι κακωθεὶς ἐνδεέστερος αὐτοῦ φανήναι.

68. Τότε δ' οὖν ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ Μίλωνος δίκην ἐκ τοῦ φορείου προελθὼν καὶ θεασάμενος τὸν Πομπηῖον ἄνω καθεζόμενον ὥσπερ ἐν στρατοπέδῳ, καὶ κύκλῳ τὰ ὅπλα περιλάμποντα τὴν ἀγορὰν, συνεχύθη καὶ μόλις ἐνῆρξαστο τοῦ λόγου κραδαινόμενος τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὴν φωνὴν ἐνισχύομενος, αὐτοῦ τοῦ Μίλωνος εὐθαρσῶς καὶ ἀνδρείως παρισταμένου τῷ ἀγῶνι καὶ κόμῃν θρέψαι καὶ μεταβαλεῖν ἐσθῆτα φαιὰν ἀπαξιώσαντος· ὅπερ οὐχ ἥκιστα δοκεῖ συναίτιον αὐτῷ γενέσθαι τῆς καταδίκης.<sup>4</sup> Ἀλλ' ὁ γε Κικέρων διὰ ταῦτα φιλέταιρος μᾶλλον ἢ δειλὸς ἔδοξεν εἶναι.

69. XXXVI. Γίνεται δὲ καὶ τῶν ἱερέων, οὓς Αὔγουρας Ῥωμαῖοι κα- 63 B.C. λοῦσιν, ἀντὶ Κράσσου τοῦ νέου μετὰ τὴν ἐν Πάρθοις αὐτοῦ τελευταίην.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> (A) Cp. on the Milonian affair: *pro Mil.* with Ascon.; Dio XL. 48 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Liv. *Perioch.* 111 vir nihil minus quam ad bella natus.

<sup>3</sup> (A) E.g. Cic. *de orat.* I. 26, 121; *pro Deiot.* I. 1; *pro Cluent.* 18, 57; *Div. in Caec.* 13, 41; *Acad.* II. 20, 64.

<sup>4</sup> (A) Ascon. *in Mil.* p. 31 exercitum in foro . . . non tantum ex oratione et annalibus sed etiam ex libro apparet qui Ciceronis nomine inscribitur de opt. gen. orat. (= c. 4, 10); p. 42 itaque non ea, qua solitus erat, constantia dixit; Schol. Bob. *in Mil.* p. 276 circumpositi iudicio milites . . . metu consternatus et ipse Tullius pedem rettulit; Dio Cass. XL. 54, 1.

<sup>5</sup> (A) Cic. *Phil.* II. 2, 4; *Brut.* I. 1.



51 B.C. Εἵτα κλήρω λαχὼν τῶν ἐπαρχιῶν Κιλικίαν καὶ στρατὸν ὀπλιτῶν μυρίων καὶ δισχιλίων, ἰππέων δὲ δισχιλίων ἑξακοσίων,<sup>1</sup> ἔπλευσε, προσταχθὲν αὐτῷ καὶ τὰ περὶ Καππαδοκίαν Ἀριοβαρζάνῃ τῷ βασιλεῖ φίλα καὶ πειθήνια παρασχεῖν.<sup>2</sup> Ταῦτά τε δὴ παρεστήσατο καὶ συνήρμοσεν ἀμέμπτως ἄτερ πολέμου, τοὺς τε Κίλικας ὁρῶν πρὸς τὸ Παρθικὸν πταῖσμα Ῥωμαίων καὶ τὸν ἐν Συρίᾳ νεωτερισμὸν ἐπηρμένους κατεπράυνεν ἡμέρως ἄρχων.

70. Καὶ δῶρα μὲν οὐδὲ τῶν βασιλέων διδόντων ἔλαβε, δειπνῶν δὲ τοὺς ἐπαρχικοὺς ἀνῆκεν· αὐτὸς δὲ καθ' ἡμέραν τοὺς χαρίεντας ἀνελάμβανεν ἐστίασιν οὐ πολυτελῶς, ἀλλ' ἐλευθερίως. Ἡ δ' οἰκία θυρωρὸν οὐκ εἶχεν, οὐδ' αὐτὸς ὥφθη κατακείμενος ὑπ' οὐδενός, ἀλλ' ἔωθεν ἐστὼς ἡ περιπατῶν πρὸ τοῦ δωματίου τοὺς ἀσπαζομένους ἐδεξιούτο.

Λέγεται δὲ μήτε ῥάβδους αἰκίσασθαι τινα μήτ' ἐσθῆτα περισχίσαι μήτε βλασφημίαν ὑπ' ὀργῆς ἢ ζημίας προσβαλεῖν μεθ' ὕβρεων. Ἀνευρὼν δὲ πολλὰ τῶν δημοσίων κεκλεμμένα τὰς τε πόλεις εὐπόρους ἐποίησε, καὶ τοὺς ἀποτίνοντας οὐδὲν τούτου πλεῖον παθόντας ἐπιτίμους διεφύλαξεν.<sup>3</sup>

Ἦσατο δὲ καὶ πολέμου, ληστὰς τῶν περὶ τὸν Ἀμανὸν οἰκούντων τρεψάμενος· ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ αὐτοκράτωρ ὑπὸ τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἀνηγορεύθη.<sup>4</sup>

71. Κεκιλίου δὲ τοῦ ῥήτορος δεομένου παρδάλεις αὐτῷ πρὸς τινα θέαν εἰς Ῥώμην ἐκ Κιλικίας ἀποστέλλαι, καλλωπιζόμενος ἐπὶ τοῖς πεπραγμένοις γράφει πρὸς αὐτὸν οὐκ εἶναι παρδάλεις ἐν Κιλικίᾳ· πεφενγῆναι γὰρ εἰς Καρίαν ἀγανακτούσας, ὅτι μόναι πολεμοῦνται, πάντων εἰρήνην ἔχόντων.<sup>5</sup>

72. Πλέων δ' ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπαρχίας τοῦτο μὲν Ῥόδῳ προσέσχε,<sup>6</sup> τοῦτο δ' Ἀθήναις ἐνδιέτριψεν<sup>8</sup> ἄσμενος πόθῳ τῶν πάλοι διατριβῶν. Ἀνδράσι δὲ τοῖς πρώτοις ἀπὸ παιδείας συγγενόμενος καὶ τοὺς τότε φίλους καὶ συνήθεις ἀσπασάμενος καὶ τὰ πρέποντα θαυμασθεὶς ὑπὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἐπανήλθεν, ἥδη τῶν πραγμάτων ὥσπερ ὑπὸ φλεγμονῆς ἀφισταμένων ἐπὶ τὸν ἐμφύλιον πόλεμον.<sup>9</sup>

73. XXXVII. Ἐν μὲν οὖν τῇ βουλῇ ψηφιζομένων αὐτῷ θρίαμβον ἥδιον ἂν ἔφη παρακολουθῆσαι Καίσαρι θριαμβεῖοντι συμβάσεων γενομένων.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> (D) E.g. *ad Att.* VI. 1; *ad fam.* XV. 1 ff. The number is incompatible with the statements of Cicero. <sup>2</sup> (A) *ad Att.* V. 20, 1.

<sup>3</sup> On Cicero's administration of the province, cp. e.g. *ad Att.* V. 21; VI. 2; *ad Quint. frat.* I. 1, 2: but Plutarch, as usual, gives details *not* found in Cicero.

<sup>4</sup> (A) *ad fam.* II. 10, 2 f., *victoria iusta imperator appellatus sum*; *ad Att.* V. 20, 3. <sup>5</sup> (D) \* *ad fam.* (ad Caelium) II. 10, 2.

<sup>6</sup> (A) Cic. *Brut.* I, 1.

<sup>7</sup> (A) *ad fam.* XIV. 5, 1, *pridie Id. Oct. Athenas venimus . . . cognovi ex multorum amicorum litteris . . . ad arma rem spectare.*

<sup>8</sup> (D) *ad fam.* l.c. *circiter Id. Nov.* in Italia speramus fore.

<sup>9</sup> \* *ad fam.* XVI. 11, 2; *ad Att.* IX. 4.

<sup>10</sup> (D) *ad fam.* XVI. 11, 3; *ad Att.* VI. 3, 3, 6, 4; VII. 1, 2. The decree was never passed.

ιδίῃ δὲ συνεβούλευε<sup>1</sup> πολλὰ μὲν Καίσαρι γράφων, πολλὰ δ' αὐτοῦ Πομπηίου δεόμενος, πρᾶντων ἐκάτερον καὶ παρामυνθόμενος.<sup>2</sup> Ὡς δ' ἦν ἀνήκεστα καὶ Καίσαρος ἐπερχομένου Πομπηίου οὐκ ἔμεινεν, ἀλλὰ μετὰ πολλῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν τὴν πόλιν ἐξέλιπε, ταύτης μὲν ἀπελείφθη τῆς φυγῆς ὁ Κικέρων, ἔδοξε δὲ Καίσαρι προστίθεσθαι.

74. Καὶ δηλὸς ἐστὶ τῇ γνώμῃ πολλὰ ῥιπτασθεὶς ἐπ' ἀμφότερα καὶ δισπαθήσας. Γράφει γὰρ ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς<sup>3</sup> διαπορεῖν, ποτέρωσθε χρή τρέπεσθαι, Πομπηίου μὲν ἐνδοξον καὶ καλὴν ὑπόθεσιν πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον ἔχοντος, Καίσαρος δ' ἄμεινον τοῖς πράγμασι χρωμένου καὶ μᾶλλον ἐντὸν καὶ τοῖς φίλοις σώζοντος, ὥστ' ἔχειν μὲν ὃν φύγῃ, μὴ ἔχειν δὲ πρὸς ὃν φύγῃ.<sup>4</sup> Τρεβατίου δέ, τινὸς τῶν Καίσαρος ἐταίρων, γράψαντος ἐπιστολήν, ὅτι Καίσαρ οἶται δεῖν μάλιστα μὲν αὐτὸν ἐξετάζεσθαι μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐλπίδων μετέχειν, εἰ δ' ἀναδύεται διὰ γῆρας, εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα βαδίζειν κακεὶ καθήμενον ἡσυχίαν ἀγειν ἐκποδῶν ἀμφοτέροις γενόμενον, θυνμάσας ὁ Κικέρων, ὅτι Καίσαρ αὐτὸς οὐκ ἔγραψεν, ἀπεκρίνατο πρὸς ὀργήν, ὡς οὐδὲν ἀνάζιον πράξει τῶν πεπολιτευμένων. Τὰ μὲν οὖν ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς γεγραμμένα τοιαῦτά ἐστι.<sup>5</sup>

75. XXXVIII. Τοῦ δὲ Καίσαρος εἰς Ἰβηρίαν ἀπάραντος εὐθὺς ὡς 49 B.C. Πομπηίου ἔπλευσε.<sup>6</sup> καὶ τοῖς μὲν ἄλλοις ἀσμένους ὤφθη, Κάτων δ' αὐτὸν ἰδὼν ἰδίᾳ πολλὰ κατεμέμφετο Πομπηίῳ προσθέμενον· αὐτῷ μὲν γὰρ οὐχὶ καλῶς ἔχειν ἐγκαταλιπεῖν ἣν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς εἴλετο τῆς πολιτείας τάξιν, ἐκείνον δὲ χρησιμώτερον ὄντα τῇ πατρίδι καὶ τοῖς φίλοις, εἰ μένων ἴσος ἐκεῖ πρὸς τὸ ἀποβαῖνον ἡρμόζετο, κατ' οὐδένα λογισμὸν οὐδ' ἐξ ἀνάγκης πολέμιον γεγονέναι Καίσαρι καὶ τοσούτου μεθέξοντα κινδύνου δεῦρ' ἦκει. Οὐτοί τε δὴ τοῦ Κικέρωνος ἀνέστοεςφον οἱ λόγοι τὴν γνώμην, καὶ τὸ μέγα μηδὲν αὐτῷ χρησθαι Πομπηίου.

76. Αἰτίως δ' ἦν αὐτὸς οὐκ ἀρνούμενος μεταμέλεισθαι, φλαυρίζων<sup>7</sup> δὲ τοῦ Πομπηίου τὴν παρασκευὴν<sup>8</sup> καὶ πρὸς τὰ βουλευήματα δυσκολαινών

<sup>1</sup> (A) *ad Att.* VII. 3, 4; IX. 5; *Phil.* II. 9, 22 ff.

<sup>2</sup> (A) E.g. *ad fam.* XVI. 12, 1, ut veni ad urbem non destiti omnia et sentire et dicere et facere quae ad concordiam pertinerent etc.; *Plut. Caes.* 31; *Pomp.* 59; *App. B.C.* II. 36.

<sup>3</sup> (A) E.g. *ad Att.* VII. 1 ff.

<sup>4</sup> (A) *ad Att.* VIII. 7, 2, ego vero quem fugiam habeo, quem sequar non habeo.

<sup>5</sup> *ad Att.* VII. 17; X. 8 f. Cp. p. 10 f.

<sup>6</sup> (A) *ad Att.* VIII. 3 ff.; IX. 2 ff.; Dio Cass. XLI. 4 ff.; *App. B. C.* II. 35 ff.; *Plut. Pomp.* 60 f.; *Caes.* 32 ff.; *Suet. Caes.* 31.

<sup>7</sup> (A) *ad fam.* VI. 6, 10, causae, quam Pompeius animatus melius quam paratus susceperat; VII. 3, 2, cuius me mei facti poenituit . . . propter vitia multa quae ibi offendi quo veneram.

<sup>8</sup> (A) *Macrobian. Satur.* II. 3, 7, cum ad Pompeium venisset dicentibus sero eum venisse, respondit: Minime sero veni, nam nihil hic paratum video; *Cic. Phil.* II. 16, 40, ne de iocis quidem respondebo, quibus me in castris usum esse dixisti.

ὑποῦλως, καὶ τοῦ παρασκώπτειν τι καὶ λέγειν χαρίεν εἰς τοὺς συμμάχους οὐκ ἀπεχόμενος, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς μὲν ἀγέλαστος αἰεὶ περιῶν ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ καὶ σκυθρωπός, ἑτέροις δὲ παρέχων γέλωτα μηδὲν δεομένους.

77. Βέλτιον δὲ καὶ τούτων ὀλίγα παραθέσθαι. Δομιτίου τοῖνυν ἀνθρωπον εἰς τάξιν ἡγεμονικὴν ἄγοντος οὐ πολεμικὸν καὶ λόγοντος, ὡς ἐπιεικῆς τὸν τρόπον ἐστὶ καὶ σώφρων, “Τί οὖν,” εἶπεν, “οὐκ ἐπίτροπον αὐτὸν τοῖς τέκνοις φυλάσσεις;”

Ἐπαινούντων δὲ τινων Θεοφάνην τὸν Λέσβιον, ὃς ἦν ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ τεκτόνων ἑπαρχος, ὡς εὖ παραμυθίσαιτο Ῥοδίου τὸν στόλον ἀποβαλόντας, “Ἡλίκον,” εἶπεν, “ἀγαθὸν ἐστὶ τὸ Γραικὸν ἔχειν ἑπαρχον.”

Καῖσαρος δὲ κατορθούντος τὰ πλεῖστα καὶ τρόπον τινα πολιορκούντος αὐτοὺς, Λέντλῳ μὲν εἰπόντι πυνθάνεσθαι στυγνοὺς εἶναι τοὺς Καῖσαρος φίλους, ἀπεκρίνατο, “Λέγεις αὐτοὺς δυσνοεῖν Καῖσαρι.”

Μαρκίου δὲ τινος ἡκοντος ἐξ Ἰταλίας νεωστὶ καὶ λόγοντος ἐν Ῥώμῃ φήμην ἐπικρατεῖν, ὡς πολιορκοῦτο Πομπηῖος, “Εἴτ' ἐξέπλευσας,” εἶπεν, “ἵνα τοῦτο πιστεύσης αὐτὸς θεασάμενος;”

Μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἦτταν Νοννίου μὲν εἰπόντος, ὅτι δεῖ χρηστὰς ἐλπίδας ἔχειν, ἐπτά γὰρ αἰτοὺς ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ τοῦ Πομπηίου λελεῖφθαι, “Καλῶς ἂν,” ἔφη, “παρῆναι, εἰ κολοιοῖς ἐπολεμοῦμεν.”

Λαβιηνοῦ δὲ μαντείας τισὶν ἰσχυριζομένου καὶ λόγοντος, ὡς δεῖ περιγενέσθαι Πομπηῖον, “Οὐκοῦν,” ἔφη, “στρατηγῆματι τούτῳ χρώμενοι νῦν ἀποβεβλήκαμεν τὸ στρατόπεδον.”<sup>1</sup>

Aug. 9,  
48 B.C.

78. XXXIX. Ἀλλὰ γὰρ γενομένης τῆς κατὰ Φάρσαλον μάχης, ἧς οὐ μετέσχε δι' ἄρρωστίαν,<sup>2</sup> καὶ Πομπηίου φυγόντος, ὃ μὲν Κάτων<sup>3</sup> καὶ στρατεύμα συγχὸν ἐν Δυρραχίῳ καὶ στόλον ἔχων μέγαν ἐκείνον ἡξίου στρατηγεῖν κατὰ νόμον καὶ τὸ τῆς ὑπατεῖς ἀξίωμα προῦχοντα.

Διωθόμενος δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν ὁ Κικέρων καὶ ὅλως φεύγων τὸ συστρατεῦσθαι<sup>4</sup> παρ' οὐδὲν ἦλθεν ἀναρεθῆναι, Πομπηίου τοῦ νέου καὶ τῶν φίλων προδότῃν ἀποκαλούντων καὶ τὰ ξίφη σπασαμένων, εἰ μὴ Κάτων ἐνστάς μολὶς ἀφείλετο καὶ διῆκεν αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ στρατοπέδου.<sup>5</sup>

48-47  
B.C.

79. Κατασχὼν δ' εἰς Βρεντέσιον ἐνταῦθα διέτριβε,<sup>6</sup> Καῖσαρα περιμένων βραδύνοντα διὰ τὰς ἐν Ἀσίᾳ καὶ περὶ Αἴγυπτον ἀσχολίας. Ἐπεὶ δ' εἰς Τάραντα καθωρμισμένος ἀπηγγέλλετο καὶ πεζῇ περιῶν ἐκείθεν εἰς Βρεντέσιον,

<sup>1</sup> (D) This retort furnishes the irrefutable proof that it, and along with it this entire batch of witticisms, was not taken from Tiro's *de iocis Ciceronis*, for Labienus fell at Pharsalus while Cicero was at Dyrrhachium.

<sup>2</sup> (A) *ad fam.* IX. 16, 7, in acie non fui; Liv. *Perioch.* 111 Cicero in castris remansit.

<sup>3</sup> (A) E.g. Dio Cass. XLII. 10 ὁ Κάτων ἐν τῷ Δυρραχίῳ . . . καταλειφθεὶς.

<sup>4</sup> *ad fam.* VII. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Plut. *Cat. Min.* 55.

<sup>6</sup> (A) E.g. *ad fam.* XI. 27; XIV. 11; *ad Att.* XI. 15.



ᾠρμησε πρὸς αὐτόν, οὐ πάνν μὲν ὦν δίσελπις, αἰδούμενος δὲ πολλῶν παρόντων ἀνδρὸς ἐχθροῦ καὶ κρατοῦντος λαμβάνειν πείρην. Οὐ μὲν ἰδέησεν αὐτῷ πράξει τι παρ' ἀξίαν ἢ εἰπεῖν. 'Ο γὰρ Καῖσαρ, ὡς εἶδεν αὐτὸν πολὺ πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπαντῶντα, κατέβη καὶ ἡσπάσατο καὶ διαλεγόμενος μόνῃ συγχῶν σταδίων ὁδὸν προῆλθεν.

Ἐκ δὲ τούτου διετέλει τιμῶν καὶ φιλοφρονούμενος,<sup>1</sup> ὥστε καὶ γράφοντι <sup>46 B.C.</sup> λόγον ἐγκώμιον Κάτωνος ἀντιγράφων<sup>2</sup> τὸν τε λόγον αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν βίον ὡς μάλιστα τῷ Περικλέους εὐκότα καὶ Θηραμένους ἐπαινεῖν. 'Ο μὲν οὖν Κικέρωνος λόγος Κάτων, ὁ δὲ Καῖσαρος Ἀντικάτων ἐπιγέγραπται.

80. Λέγεται δὲ καὶ Κοῖντου Λιγαρίου δίκην φεύγοντος, ὅτι τῶν <sup>Sep. 23, 46 B.C.</sup> Καίσαρος πολεμίων εἰς ἐγεγόνει, καὶ Κικέρωνος αὐτῷ βοηθοῦντος, εἰπεῖν τὸν Καῖσαρα πρὸς τοὺς φίλους· "Τί κωλύει διὰ χρόνου Κικέρωνος ἀκοῦσαι λόγοντος, ἐπεὶ πάλαι κέκριται πονηρὸς ἀνὴρ καὶ πολέμιος;" ἐπεὶ δ' ἀρξάμενος λέγειν ὁ Κικέρων ὑπερφυῶς ἐκίνει καὶ προὔβαινεν αὐτῷ πάθει τε ποικίλου καὶ χάριτι θαυμαστὸς ὁ λόγος, πολλὰς μὲν ἰέναι χρόας ἐπὶ τοῦ προσώπου τὸν Καῖσαρα, πάσας δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς τρεπόμενον τροπὰς κατὰδηλον εἶναι, τέλος δὲ τῶν κατὰ Φάρσαλον ἀψαμένου τοῦ ῥήτορος ἀγώνων ἐκπαθῇ γερόμενον τιναχθῆναι τῷ σώματι καὶ τῆς χειρὸς ἐκβαλεῖν ἔνια τῶν γραμματειῶν. Τὸν γοῦν ἄνθρωπον ἀπέλυσε τῆς αἰτίας βεβιασμένος.<sup>3</sup>

81. XL. Ἐκ τούτου Κικέρων, εἰς μοναρχίαν τῆς πολιτείας μεθεστῶσης, <sup>45 B.C.</sup> ἀφόμενος τοῦ τὰ κοινὰ πράττειν<sup>4</sup> ἐσχόλαζε τοῖς βουλομένοις φιλοσοφεῖν<sup>5</sup> τῶν νέων,<sup>6</sup> καὶ σχεδὸν ἐκ τῆς πρὸς τούτους συνηθείας, εὐγενεστάτους καὶ πρῶτους ὄντας, αὐθις ἴσχυεν ἐν τῇ πόλει μέγιστον.

82. Αὐτῷ δ' ἔργον μὲν ἦν τὸ τοὺς φιλοσόφους συντελεῖν διαλόγους <sup>45-44 B.C.</sup> καὶ μεταφράζειν,<sup>7</sup> καὶ τῶν διαλεκτικῶν ἢ φυσικῶν ὀνομάτων ἕκαστον εἰς Ῥωμαϊκὴν μεταβάλλειν διάλεκτον·<sup>8</sup> ἐκεῖνος γάρ ἐστιν, ὡς φασιν, ὁ καὶ

<sup>1</sup> (A) E.g. *ad fam.* IV. 13, 2; IX. 16.

<sup>2</sup> (A) E.g. *ad Att.* XII. 40; *Topica* 25, 94; Tac. *Ann.* IV. 34; Schol. *ad Iuv.* VI. 338; Plut. *Caes.* 54, 3; App. *B. C.* II. 99; Dio Cass. XLIII. 13, 4; Suet. *Aug.* 85.

<sup>3</sup> (D) \* Cic. *ad fam.* VI. 14, 2.

<sup>4</sup> (A) E.g. *ad fam.* V. 16; VI. 12, 5; IX. 1, 2, 2, 5, 20, 1; XII. 23; *de off.* II. 1, 2; III. 1, 2; *de div.* II. 2, 6; *Acad. Post.* I. 3, 11.

<sup>5</sup> (A) *ad fam.* VII. 33, 2; IX. 16, 7, 18, 1, 20, 3; *Phil.* II. 8, 20; Sen. *Contr.* I. *proem.* 11; Suet. *de rhet.* 1.

<sup>6</sup> (A) E.g. Hirtius, Pansa, Dolabella, Cassius.

<sup>7</sup> (A) *ad Att.* XII. 52, 3, ἀπόγραφα sunt, minore labore fiunt, verba tantum affero, quibus abundo.

<sup>8</sup> φαντασία = visum (*Acad.* I. 11, 40); συγκατάθεσις = assensio, approbatio (*Acad.* II. 12, 37); ἐποχή = retentio assensionis (*Acad.* II. 18, 59); κατάληψις = comprehensio, cognitio, perceptio (*Acad.* I. 11, 41; II. 10, 31, 47, 145; *de fin.* III. 5, 17); ἀτομον = individuum (*de fin.* I. 6, 17); κενόν = vacuus

τὴν φαντασίαν καὶ τὴν συγκατάθεσιν καὶ τὴν ἐποχὴν καὶ τὴν κατάληψιν, ἔτι δὲ τὸ ἄτομον, τὸ ἄμερές, τὸ κενόν, ἄλλα τε πολλὰ<sup>1</sup> τῶν τοιούτων ἐξονομάσας πρῶτος ἢ μάλιστα Ῥωμαίοις, τὰ μὲν μεταφοραῖς, τὰ δ' οἰκειότησιν ἄλλαις γνῶριμα καὶ προσήγορα μηχανησάμενος.

83. τῇ δὲ πρὸς τὴν ποιήσιν εὐκολία παΐζων ἐχρήτο. Λέγεται γάρ, ὁπηνίκα ῥυεῖ πρὸς τὸ τοιοῦτον, τῆς νυκτὸς ἔπη ποιεῖν πεντακόσια.<sup>2</sup>

84. Τὸ μὲν οὖν πλείστον τοῦ χρόνου τούτου περὶ Τοῦσκων ἐν χωρίοις αὐτοῦ διάγων ἔγραφε πρὸς τοὺς φίλους Λαέρτου βίον ζῆν, εἴτε παΐζων, ὡς ἔθος εἶχεν, εἴθ' ὑπὸ φιλοτιμίας σπαργῶν πρὸς τὴν πολιτείαν καὶ ἀδημονῶν τοῖς καθεστῶσι.

Σπανίως δ' εἰς ἄστυ θεραπείας ἔνεκα τοῦ Καίσαρος κατῆι, καὶ πρῶτος ἦν τῶν συναγορευόντων ταῖς τιμαῖς καὶ λέγειν αἰεὶ τι καινὸν εἰς τὸν ἄνδρα καὶ τὰ πραττόμενα φιλοτιμουμένων.<sup>3</sup>

Οἶόν ἐστι καὶ τὸ περὶ τῶν Πομπητίου λεχθέν ἐικόνων, ἅς ἀνηρημένας καὶ καταβεβλημένας ὁ Καῖσαρ ἐκέλευσεν ἀνασταθῆναι· καὶ ἀνεστάθησαν. Ἐφη γὰρ ὁ Κικέρων, ὅτι ταύτῃ τῇ φιλανθρωπίᾳ Καῖσαρ τοὺς μὲν Πομπητίου ἴστησι, τοὺς δ' αὐτοῦ πῆγνυσιν ἀνδριάντας.

85. XLI. Διανοούμενος δ', ὡς λέγεται, τὴν πάτριον ἱστορίαν γραφῇ περιλαβεῖν<sup>4</sup> καὶ πολλὰ συμμῖξαι τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν καὶ ὅλως τοὺς συνηγμένους λόγους αὐτῷ καὶ μύθους ἐνταῦθα τρέψαι, πολλοῖς μὲν δημοσίοις, πολλοῖς δ' ἰδίοις κατελήφθη πράγμασιν ἀβουλήτοις καὶ πάθεσιν, ὧν αὐθαίρετα δοκεῖ πλείστα συμβῆναι.

46-45  
B.C.

86. Πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ἀπεπέμψατο τὴν γυναῖκα Τερεντίαν<sup>5</sup> ἀμεληθεὶς ὑπ' αὐτῆς παρὰ τὸν πόλεμον, ὥστε καὶ τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἐφοδίων ἐνδεὴς ἀποσταλῆναι καὶ μηδ' ὅτε κατῆρεν αὐτὴ εἰς Ἰταλίαν τυχεῖν εὐγνώμονος. Αὐτὴ μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ἤλθεν, ἐν Βρεντεσίῳ διατρίβοντος αὐτοῦ πολὺν χρόνον, ἐρχομένη δὲ τῇ θυγατρὶ, παιδίσκῃ νέᾳ, τοσαύτην ὁδὸν οὐ πομπὴν πρέπουσαν, οὐ χορηγίαν παρέσχεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν τῷ Κικέρωνι πάντων ἔρημον καὶ κενὴν ἀπέδειξεν

(*ad Att.* IX. 1), but some of these had already been Latinized, e.g. by Lucretius. *ἄμερές*, with its Latin equivalent, does not occur in the extant works of Cicero. See also *Acad.* I. 5. 14. 24 ff.; *de fin.* III. 2, 5. 15; *Tusc.* III. 8, 16; *de orat.* I. 34, 154.

<sup>1</sup> E.g. *essentia* = οὐσία, cp. Sen. *Epist.* 58, 6; *quantitas*, *qualitas* (ποσότης, ποιότης); *evidentia* (ἐνάργεια); *pronuntiatum* (ἄξιωμα); *appetitio animi* (ὁρμή).

<sup>2</sup> Cp. § 5 and p. 31.

<sup>3</sup> (A) E.g. *ad fam.* IV. 4. 13; VI. 12; IX. 16.

<sup>4</sup> (A) Corn. Nep. *fragm.* (Peter, *Fragm. hist. Rom.* p. 223); Cic. *de leg.* I. 5; Calen. ap. Dio Cass. XLVI. 21 *προθέμενος* γὰρ πάντα τὰ τῇ πόλει πεπραγμένα συγγράψαι, *ἐπειτ'* οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς κτίσεως αὐτῆς . . . ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ τῆς ὑπατείας τῆς ἐαυτοῦ ἤρξατο *ad Att.* XIV. 14, 5.

<sup>5</sup> Divorce 46 B.C.: *ad fam.* IV. 14; XIV. 11; *ad Att.* XI. 16. 17; XII. 22; Dio Cass. XLVI. 18, 3. Cp. Tyrrell and Purser, *Corresp. of Cic.* I p. 37 ff., IV p. XLV ff., and above pp. 19 f. 42.

ἐπὶ πολλοῖς ὀφλήμῃσι καὶ μεγάλοις. Αὐταὶ γὰρ εἰσιν αἱ λεγόμεναι τῆς διαστάσεως εὐπρεπέσταται προφάσεις. Τῇ δὲ Τερεντίᾳ καὶ ταύτας ἀρῶν-  
μένη λαμπρὰν ἐποίησε τὴν ἀπολογίαν αὐτὸς ἐκείνος μετ' οὐ πολὺν χρόνον  
γῆμῃς παρθένον, ὡς μὲν ἡ Τερεντία κατεφίμῃζεν, ἔρωτι τῆς ὥρας, ὡς δὲ  
Τίρων ὁ τοῦ Κικέρωνος ἀπελευθερὸς γέγραφε, εὐπορίας ἔνεκεν πρὸς διά-  
λυτον δανείων. Ἦν γὰρ ἡ παῖς σφόδρα πλουσία, καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν αὐτῆς ὁ  
Κικέρων ἐν πίστει κληρονόμος ἀπολειφθεὶς διεφύλαττεν. Ὁφείλων δὲ πολ-  
λὰς μυριάδας ὑπὸ τῶν φίλων καὶ οἰκείων ἐπέστη τὴν παῖδα γῆμαι παρ'  
ἡλικίαν καὶ τοὺς δανειστάς ἀπαλλάξαι τοῖς ἐκείνης χρησάμενον.<sup>1</sup>

Ἀντώνιος δὲ τοῦ γάμου μνησθεὶς ἐν ταῖς πρὸς τοὺς Φιλιππικοὺς  
ἀντιγραφαῖς ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτόν φησι γυναῖκα, παρ' ἣ ἐγήρασε· χαριέντως  
αἶμα τὴν οἰκουρίαν ὡς ἀπράκτου καὶ ἀστρατεύτου παρασκόπτων τοῦ Κικέρωνος.

Γήμαντι δ' αὐτῷ μετ' οὐ πολὺν χρόνον ἡ θυγάτηρ ἀπέθανε τίκτουσα παρὰ 45 B.C.  
Λέντλῳ.<sup>2</sup> τοῦτῳ γὰρ ἐγμήθη μετὰ τὴν Πείσωνος τοῦ προτέρου ἀνδρὸς  
τελευτήν. Καὶ συνηλθον μὲν ἐπὶ τὴν παραμυθίαν τῷ Κικέρωνι πανταχόθεν  
οἱ φιλόσοφοι.<sup>3</sup> βαρέως δ' ἄγαν ἦνεγκε τὸ συμβεβηκός, ὥστε καὶ τὴν γαμῃ  
θεῖαν ἀποπέμψασθαι δόξασαν ἡσθήναι τῇ τελευτῇ τῆς Τυλλίας.<sup>4</sup> 46 B.C.

XLII. Τὰ μὲν οὖν κατ' οἶκον οὕτως εἶχε τῷ Κικέρωνι.

87. Τῆς δ' ἐπὶ Καίσαρα συνισταμένης πράξεως οὐ μετέσχε, καίπερ ὦν  
ἐταῖρος ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα Βρούτου καὶ βαρύνεσθαι τὰ παρόντα καὶ τὰ πάλαι  
ποθεῖν πράγματα δοκῶν, ὡς ἕτερος οὐδεὶς. Ἀλλ' ἔδεισαν οἱ ἄνδρες αὐτοῦ τὴν  
τε φύσιν ὡς ἐνδεὰ τόλμης τὸν τε χρόνον, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ταῖς ἐρρωμενεστάταις  
φύσεσιν ἐπιλείπει τὸ θαρρεῖν.<sup>5</sup>

Ὡς δ' οὖν ἐπέπρακτο τοῖς περὶ Βρούτου καὶ Κάσσιον τὸ ἔργον καὶ τῶν 44 B.C.  
Καίσαρος φίλων συνισταμένων ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας αὐτῆς ἦν δέος ἐμφυλίοις  
πολέμοις περιπετῇ γενέσθαι τὴν πόλιν, Ἀντώνιος μὲν ὑπατεύων τὴν βουλὴν  
συνήγαγε καὶ βραχέα<sup>6</sup> διελέχθη περὶ ὁμονοίας, Κικέρων δὲ πολλὰ πρὸς  
τὸν καιρὸν οἰκείως διελθὼν ἔπεισε τὴν σύγκλητον Ἀθηναίους μμησαμένην  
ἀμνηστίαν<sup>7</sup> τῶν ἐπὶ Καίσαρι ψηφίσασθαι, νείμαι δὲ τοῖς περὶ Κάσσιον καὶ

<sup>1</sup> *ad fam.* IV. 14; *ad Att.* XII. 22, I. 32, I.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. *ad Att.* XII. 15. 18<sup>a</sup> ff.; *ad fam.* IV. 6; VI. 18, 5; Ascon. in *Pis.* I  
filiam post mortem Pisonis generi, P. Lentulo collocavit, apud quem illa ex  
partu decessit.

<sup>3</sup> (A) Caesar (*ad Att.* XIII. 20), Brutus (*ad Att.* XII. 13), Lucceius (*ad fam.*  
V. 13), Sulpicius (*ad fam.* IV. 5. 6). <sup>4</sup> (A) *ad Att.* XII. 32.

<sup>5</sup> (D) *Phil.* II. 11 ff.; Dio Cass. XLIV. 20; XLVI. 22; *ad fam.* XII. 2.

<sup>6</sup> (D) *Phil.* I. 1, 2. 13, 32.

<sup>7</sup> (A) *Phil.* II. 35, 88; I. 1, 1, ieci fundamenta pacis Atheniensiumque  
renovavi vetus exemplum Graecum etiam verbum (sc. ἀμνηστία) usurpari etc.;  
Vell. Pat. II. 58, 2; App. B. C. II. 126 ff. 142; Dio XLIV. 22. esp. 26. 33-  
34, 1, Κικέρων μὲν ταῦτα εἰπὼν ἔπεισε τὴν γερουσίαν μηδένα μηδενὶ μνησικακῆσαι  
ψηφίσασθαι Zonaras X. 12; Plut. *Brut.* 19.



Βρούτον ἐπαρχίας. Ἔσχε δὲ τούτων τέλος οὐδέν. Ὁ γὰρ δῆμος αὐτὸς μὲν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ πρὸς οἶκτον ἐξαχθεῖς,<sup>1</sup> ὡς εἶδε τὸν νεκρὸν ἐκκοιμζόμενον δι' ἀγορᾶς, Ἀντωνίου δὲ καὶ τὴν ἐσθῆτα δέξαντος αὐτοῖς αἵματος κατὰπλεων καὶ κεκομμένην πάντῃ τοῖς ξίφεσιν, ἐκμανέντες ὑπ' ὀργῆς ἐν ἀγορᾷ ζήτησιν ἐποιούντο τῶν ἀνδρῶν, καὶ πῦρ ἔχοντες ἐπὶ τὰς οἰκίας ἔθεον ὡς ὑφάψοντες. Οἱ δὲ τούτον μὲν τῷ προπεφυλάχθαι διέφυγον τὸν κίνδυνον, ἐτέρους δὲ πολλοὺς καὶ μεγάλους προσδοκῶντες ἐξέλιπον τὴν πόλιν.

XLIII. Εὐθύς οὖν ὁ Ἀντώνιος ἐπήρτο, καὶ πᾶσι μὲν ἦν φοβερός ὡς μοναρχήσων, τῷ δὲ Κικέρωνι φοβερώτατος.

88. Ἀναρρωννυμένην τε γὰρ αὐτῷ πάλιν ὄρων τὴν δύναμιν ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ καὶ τοῖς περὶ Βρούτον ἐπιτήδειον εἰδὼς ἤχθετο παρόντι. Καί ποῦ τι καὶ προὔπηρχεν ὑποψίας αὐτοῖς πρὸς ἀλλήλους κατὰ τὴν τῶν βίων ἀνομοιότητα καὶ διαφοράν. Ταῦτα δέαςας ὁ Κικέρων πρῶτον μὲν ὥρμησε πρεσβευτὴς Δολοβέλλα συνεκπλεύσαι εἰς Συρίαν·<sup>2</sup> ἐπεὶ δ' οἱ μέλλοντες ὑπατεύειν μετ' Ἀντωνίου, Ἰρτιος καὶ Πάνσας, ἀνδρες ἀγαθοὶ καὶ ζηλωταὶ τοῦ Κικέρωνος, ἐδέοντο μὴ σφᾶς καταλιπεῖν, ὑποδεχόμενοι καταλύσειν Ἀντώνιον ἐκείνου παρόντος; ὁ δ'

44 B.C. οὐτ' ἀπιστῶν παντάπασιν οὔτε πιστεύων Δολοβέλλαν μὲν εἶασε χαίρειν, ὁμολογήσας δὲ τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἰρτιον τὸ θέρος ἐν Ἀθήναις διάξειν, ὅταν δ' ἐκείνοι παραλάβωσι τὴν ἀρχήν, ἀφίξεσθαι πάλιν, αὐτὸς καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἐξέπλευσε. Γενομένης δὲ περὶ τὸν πλοῦν διατριβῆς καὶ λόγων ἀπὸ Ῥώμης, οἷα φιλεῖ, καὶνῶν προσπεσόντων, μεταβεβλήσθαι μὲν Ἀντωνίον θαυμαστὴν μεταβολὴν καὶ πάντα πράττειν καὶ πολιτεύσθαι πρὸς τὴν σύγκλητον, ἐνδεῖν δὲ τῆς ἐκείνου παρουσίας τὰ πράγματα μὴ τὴν ἀρίστην ἔχειν διάθεσιν, καταμεμψάμενος αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ τὴν πολλὴν εὐλάβειαν ἀνέστρεφεν αὐτὸς εἰς Ῥώμην.<sup>3</sup> Καὶ τῶν πρῶτων οὐ διημάρτανεν ἐλπίδων· τοσοῦτον πλῆθος ἀνθρώπων ὑπὸ χαρᾶς καὶ πόθου πρὸς τὴν ἀπάντησιν ἐξεχύθη, καὶ σχεδὸν ἡμερήσιον ἀνήλωσαν χρόνον αἱ περὶ τὰς πύλας καὶ τὴν εἴσοδον αὐτοῦ δεξιώσεις καὶ φιλοφροσύναι.

Τῇ δ' ὑστεραίᾳ βουλὴν συναγαγόντος Ἀντωνίου καὶ καλοῦντος αὐτὸν οὐκ ἦλθεν,<sup>4</sup> ἀλλὰ κατέκειτο μαλακῶς ἔχειν ἐκ τοῦ κόπου σκηπτόμενος. Ἐδόκει δὲ τάλληθες ἐπιβουλῆς εἶναι φόβος ἕκ τινος ὑποψίας καὶ μηνύσεως καθ' ὅδον αὐτῷ προσπεσούσης. Ἀντώνιος δὲ χαλεπῶς μὲν εἶχεν ἐπὶ τῇ διαβολῇ καὶ στρατιώτας ἔπεμψεν ἄγειν αὐτὸν ἢ καταπρῆσαι τὴν οἰκίαν κελύσας, ἐνστάτων δὲ πολλῶν καὶ δεηθέντων ἐνέχυρα λαβὼν μόνον ἐπαύσατο. Καὶ τὸ

<sup>1</sup> Cic. *ad Att.* XIV. 10 *laudatus miserabiliter*; *servique et egentes in tecta nostra cum facibus inmissi*; *Phil.* II. 36, 90, *tua illa pulchra laudatio etc.*; III. 12, 30, *caedis et incendiorum causam quaesierit ex funere*? These seem to be the only direct allusions to the famous funeral speech in Cicero.

<sup>2</sup> (A) *E.g. Phil.* I. 2, 6; III; V; XI; — *ad Att.* XIV. 7 ff.; XV. 8; XVI. 3f.

<sup>3</sup> (A) *E.g. ad Att.* XVI. 7; *ad fam.* XII. 25; esp. *Phil.* I. 3, 7 ff.

<sup>4</sup> (A) *Phil.* I. 5, 11, *solusne aberam . . . at ille, audiente senatu, cum fabris se domum meam venturum esse dixit. Nimis iracunde hoc quidem*; V. 7, 19 f.

λοιπὸν οὕτως ἀντιπαρεξίοντες ἀτρέμα καὶ φυλαττόμενοι διετέλουν. ἄχρι οὗ Καῖσαρ ὁ νέος ἐξ Ἀπολλωνίως παραγενόμενος τὸν τε κλῆρον ἀνεδέξατο τοῦ Καῖσαρος ἐκείνου καὶ περὶ τῶν δυσχλίων πεντακοσίων μυριάδων, ὡς Ἀντώνιος ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας κατέχεν, εἰς διαφορὰν κατέστη πρὸς αὐτόν.<sup>1</sup>

89. XLIV. Ἐκ δὲ τούτου Φίλιππος ὁ τὴν μητέρα τοῦ νέου Καῖσαρος ἔχων καὶ Μάρκελλος ὁ τὴν ἀδελφὴν ἀφικόμενοι μετὰ τοῦ νεανίσκου πρὸς τὸν Κικέρωνα συνήεντο. Κικέρωνα μὲν ἐκείνῳ τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ λόγου καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς πολιτείας δύναμιν ἐν τε τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ παρέχειν,<sup>2</sup> ἐκείνου δὲ Κικέρωνι τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν χρημάτων καὶ τῶν ὄπλων ἀσφάλειαν. Ἦδη γὰρ οὐκ ὀλίγους τῶν ὑπὸ Καίσαρι στρατευσάμενων περὶ αὐτὸν εἶχε τὸ μεράκιον.

90. Ἐδόκει δὲ καὶ μίջων τις αἰτία γεγενῆσθαι τοῦ τὸν Κικέρωνα δέξασθαι προθύμως τὴν Καῖσαρος φιλίαν. Ἐτι γάρ, ὥς ἔοικε, Πομπηίου ζῶντος καὶ Καῖσαρος ἔδοξε κατὰ τοὺς ὕπνους<sup>3</sup> ὁ Κικέρων καλεῖν τινα τοὺς τῶν συγκλητικῶν παῖδας εἰς τὸ Καπιτώλιον, ὥς μέλλοντος ἐξ αὐτῶν ἓνα τοῦ Διὸς ἀποδεικνύειν τῆς Ῥώμης ἡγεμόνα· τοὺς δὲ πολίτας ὑπὸ σπουδῆς θέοντας ἴστασθαι περὶ τὸν νέον καὶ τοὺς παῖδας ἐν ταῖς περιπορφύροις καθέζεσθαι σιωπῇν ἔχοντας. Ἐξαίφνης δὲ τῶν θυρῶν ἀνοιχθεῖσών καθ' ἓνα τῶν παίδων ἀνισταμένων κύκλῳ παρὰ τὸν θεὸν παραπορεύεσθαι, τὸν δὲ πάντας ἐπισκοπεῖν καὶ ἀποπέμπειν ἀχθομένους. Ὡς δ' οὗτος ἦν προσιών κατ' αὐτόν, ἐκτείνει τὴν δεξιὰν καὶ εἰπείν, “ὦ Ῥωμαῖοι, πέρας ὑμῖν ἐμφυλίων πολέμων οὗτος ἡγεμὼν γενόμενος.” Τοιοῦτόν φασιν ἐνύπνιον ἰδόντα τὸν Κικέρωνα τὴν μὲν ἰδέειν τοῦ παιδὸς ἐκμεμάχθαι καὶ κατέχειν ἐναργῶς, αὐτὸν δ' οὐκ ἐπίστασθαι. Μεθ' ἡμέραν δὲ καταβαίνοντος εἰς τὸ πεδῖον τὸ Ἀρειον αὐτοῦ τοὺς παῖδας ἡδὴ γεγυμνασμένους ἀπέρχεσθαι, κάκεινον ὀφθῆναι τῷ Κικέρωνι πρῶτον οἷος ὥφθη καθ' ὕπνον· ἐκπλαγέντα δὲ πυνθάνεσθαι, τίνων εἴη γονέων. Ἦν δὲ πατὴρ Ὀκταυῖον τῶν οὐκ ἄγαν ἐπιφανῶν, Ἀττίας δὲ μητρός, ἀδελφιδῆς Καῖσαρος. Ὅθεν Καῖσαρ αὐτῷ παῖδας οὐκ ἔχων ἰδίους τὴν οὐσίαν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τὸν οἶκον ἐν ταῖς διαθήκαις ἔδωκεν. Ἐκ τούτου φασὶ τὸν Κικέρωνα τῷ παιδί κατὰ τὰς ἀπαντήσεις ἐντυγχάνειν ἐπιμελῶς, κάκεινον οἰκείως δέχεσθαι τὰς φιλοφροσύνας· καὶ γὰρ ἐκ τύχης αὐτῷ γεγενῆσθαι συμβεβῆκει Κικέρωνος ὑπατεύοντος.<sup>4</sup>

91. XLV. Αὐταὶ μὲν οὖν προφάσεις ἦσαν λεγόμεναι· τὸ δὲ πρὸς Ἀντώνιον μῖσος Κικέρωνα πρῶτον, εἶτα ἡ φύσις ἡττων οὕσα τιμῆς προσεποίησε Καίσαρι νομίζοντα προσλαμβάνειν τῇ πολιτείᾳ τὴν ἐκείνου δύναμιν.<sup>5</sup> Οὕτω γὰρ ὑπῆγε τὸ μεράκιον αὐτόν, ὥστε καὶ πατέρα προσαγορεύειν.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> (A) *Phil.* III. 2, 3; IV. 1, 3; V. 8, 23; *ad Att.* XVI. 8; App. B. C. III. 12; Dio XLIV. 12; Vell. Pat. II. 61, 1; Liv. *Perioch.* 117.

<sup>2</sup> (A) *ad Att.* XV. 12, 2; XVI. 11, 6; *ad fam.* XII. 23, 2; *Phil.* V. 16, 45; Dio Cass. XLV. 15, 4.

<sup>3</sup> (D) \* Suet. *Aug.* 94; Dio Cass. XLV. 2; Tertull. *de anima* 46. See p. 55 ff.

<sup>4</sup> (A) \* Suet. and Dio ll. cc. <sup>5</sup> (A) Dio Cass. XLV. 15, 4; *Phil.* V. 16.

<sup>6</sup> (A) Cp. Brut. *ad Att.* I. 17, 5, licet ergo patrem appellet Octavius Ciceronem.

43 B.C. Ἐφ' ᾧ σφόδρα Βρούτος ἀγανακτῶν ἐν ταῖς πρὸς Ἀττικὸν ἐπιστολαῖς καθήματο<sup>1</sup> τοῦ Κικέρωνος, ὅτι διὰ φόβον Ἀντωνίου θεραπέων τὸν Καίσαρα δηλὸς ἐστὶν οὐκ ἐλευθερίαν τῇ πατρίδι πράττων, ἀλλὰ δεσπότην φιλάνθρωπον αὐτῷ μνώμενος.

Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ τὸν γε παῖδα Κικέρωνος ὁ Βρούτος ἐν Ἀθήναις διατρίβοντα παρὰ τοῖς φιλοσόφοις ἀναλαβὼν ἔσχεν ἐφ' ἡγεμονίας καὶ πολλὰ χρώμενος αὐτῷ κατάρθου.<sup>2</sup>

92. Τοῦ δὲ Κικέρωνος ἀκμὴν ἔσχεν ἡ δύναμις<sup>3</sup> ἐν τῇ πόλει τότε μεγίστην, καὶ κρατῶν ὅσον ἐβούλετό τὸν μὲν Ἀντωνίων ἐξέκρουσε καὶ κατεστασίασε καὶ πολεμήσοντας αὐτῷ τοὺς δύο ὑπάτους, Ἱρτιον καὶ Πάνσαν, ἐξέπεμψε, Καίσαρι δὲ ῥαβδόχους καὶ στρατηγικὸν κόσμον,<sup>4</sup> ὥς δὴ προπολεμοῦντι τῆς πατρίδος, ἔπεισε ψηφίσασθαι τὴν σύγκλητον.

Ἐπεὶ δ' Ἀντώνιος μὲν ἦττητο, τῶν δ' ὑπάτων ἀμφοτέρων ἀποθανόντων ἐκ τῆς μάχης<sup>5</sup> πρὸς Καίσαρα συνέστησαν αἱ δυνάμεις, δέισασα δ' ἡ βουλὴ νέον ἄνδρα<sup>6</sup> καὶ τύχῃ λαμπρᾷ κεχηρμένον ἐπειράτο τιμαῖς καὶ δωρεαῖς ἀποκαλεῖν αὐτοῦ τὰ στρατεύματα καὶ περισπᾶν τὴν δύναμιν, ὥς μὴ δεομένη τῶν προπολεμοῦντων Ἀντωνίου πεφηνγός, οὕτως ὁ Καῖσαρ φοβηθεὶς ὑπέπεμπε τῷ Κικέρωνι τοὺς δεομένους καὶ πείθοντας ὑπατείαν μὲν ἀμφοτέροις ὁμοῦ πράττειν,<sup>7</sup> χρῆσθαι δὲ τοῖς πράγμασιν ὅπως αὐτὸς ἔγνωκε, παραλαμβάνοντα τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ τὸ μειράκιον διοικεῖν ὀνόματος καὶ δόξης γλιχόμενον.

93. Ὁμολόγει δὲ Καῖσαρ αὐτός, ὥς δεδιὼς κατάλυσιν καὶ κινδυνεύων ἔρημος γενέσθαι χρῆσαιτο τῇ Κικέρωνος ἐν δέοντι φιλαρχίᾳ, προτρεψάμενος αὐτὸν ὑπατείαν μετιέναι συμπράττοντος αὐτοῦ καὶ συναρχαιρεσιάζοντος.

XLVI. Ἐνταῦθα μέντοι μάλιστα Κικέρων ἐπαρθεῖς<sup>8</sup> ὑπὸ νέου γέρον καὶ φενακισθεὶς καὶ συναρχαιρεσιάσας καὶ παρσυχὼν αὐτῷ τὴν σύγκλητον εὐθύς μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν φίλων αἰτίαν εἶχεν, ὀλίγῳ δ' ὕστερον αὐτὸν ἀπολωλέως ᾗσθητο καὶ τοῦ δήμου προέμενος τὴν ἐλευθερίαν.

<sup>1</sup> In the one extant letter (*Brut. ad Att.* I. 17, 2) some such censure is implied, but it is not so expressed. Cp. also *Brut. ad Cic.* I. 16; *Cic. ad Brut.* I. 15, 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Cic. ad Brut.* I. 5, 3; II. 7, 6; *Brut. ad Cic.* II. 3; *Plut. Brut.* 24.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. the passages cited § 88<sup>1</sup> and *Plut. Ant.* 17; *Cic. ad Brut.* I. 3, 1, 10, 3. 15, 6; *App. B. C.* IV. 19 *Κικέρων δὲ μετὰ Γάϊον Καίσαρα ἔσχυνεν, ὅση γένοιτο ἂν δημαγωγὸς μοναρχία.*

<sup>4</sup> *Phil.* III; V; VIII; *ad fam.* X. 28, 1; *App. B. C.* III. 50 ff.; *Dio XLVI.* 29 ff. — *Cic. ad Brut.* I. 15, 7, *quis honos ei fuit non decernendus . . . decrevi etiam imperium . . . quid enim est sine imperio exercitus.*

<sup>5</sup> (A) *Phil.* XIV; *App. B. C.* III. 69 ff.; *Dio XLVI.* 36 ff.; *Plut. Ant.* 17.

<sup>6</sup> (A) *Dio Cass.* XLVI. 41.

<sup>7</sup> (A) *id.* XLVI. 42 f. (D) *Cic. ad Brut.* I. 10.

<sup>8</sup> (A) This was foreseen by Brutus. *Cp. ad Cic.* I. 4, 4 f. 16, 7 f.



94. Αὐξήθεις γὰρ ὁ νεανίας καὶ τὴν ὑπατείαν λαβὼν Κικέρωνι μὲν <sup>Sept. 23.</sup> εἶασε χαίρειν,<sup>1</sup> Ἀντωνίῳ δὲ καὶ Λεπίδῳ φίλος γενόμενος καὶ τὴν δύναμιν εἰς ταὐτὸ συνενεγκὼν ὥσπερ ἄλλο τι κτῆμα τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἐνείματο πρὸς αὐτοὺς.<sup>2</sup> Καὶ κατεγράφησαν ἄνδρες οὓς ἔδει θνήσκειν, ὑπὲρ διακοσίους.

Πλείστην δὲ τῶν ἀμφισβητημάτων αὐτοῖς ἔριν ἡ Κικέρωνος προγραφὴ παρέσχεν,<sup>3</sup> Ἀντωνίου μὲν ἀσυμβάτως ἔχοντος, εἰ μὴ πρῶτος ἐκείνος ἀποθνήσκοι, Λεπίδου δ' Ἀντωνίῳ προστιθεμένου, Καίσαρος δὲ πρὸς ἀμφοτέρους ἀντέχοντος. Ἐγίνοντο δ' αἱ σύνοδοι μόνοις ἀπόρρητοι περὶ πόλιν Βονωνίαν ἐφ' ἡμέρας τρεῖς, καὶ συνήσαν εἰς τόπον τινὰ πρόσω τῶν στρατοπέδων ποταμῷ περιρρέομενον.

Λέγεται δὲ τὰς πρῶτας ἡμέρας διαγωνισάμενος ὑπὲρ τοῦ Κικέρωνος ὁ Καίσαρ ἐνδοῦναι τῇ τρίτῃ καὶ προέσθαι τὸν ἄνδρα.

Τὰ δὲ τῆς ἀντιδόσεως οὕτως εἶχεν. Ἔδει Κικέρωνος ἐκστῆναι Καίσαρα, Παύλου δὲ τὰδελφοῦ Λέπιδου, Λευκίου δὲ Καίσαρος Ἀντώνιον, ὃς ἦν θεῖος αὐτῷ πρὸς μητρός.<sup>4</sup>

Οὕτως ἐξέπεσον ὑπὸ θυμοῦ καὶ λύσσης τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων λογισμῶν, μᾶλλον δ' ἀπέδειξαν ὡς οὐδὲν ἀνθρώπου θηρίον ἐστὶν ἀγριώτερον ἐξουσίαν πάθει προσλαβόντος.

95. XLVII.<sup>5</sup> Πραττομένων δὲ τούτων ὁ Κικέρων ἦν μὲν ἐν ἀγροῖς ἰδίους περὶ Τοῦσκλον ἔχων τὸν ἀδελφὸν μεθ' αὐτοῦ· πυθόμενοι δὲ τὰς προγραφὰς ἔγνωσαν εἰς Ἀστυρα μεταβῆναι, χωρίον παράλιον τοῦ Κικέρωνος· ἐκείθεν δὲ πλεῖν εἰς Μακεδονίαν πρὸς Βροῦτον· ἤδη γὰρ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ λόγος ἐφόιτα κρατοῦντος. Ἐκομίζοντο δ' ἐν φορεῖοις ἀπειρηκότες ὑπὸ λύπης· καὶ κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἐφιστάμενοι καὶ τὰ φορεῖα παραβάλλοντες ἀλλήλοις προσωλοφύροντο. Μᾶλλον δ' ὁ Κόϊντος ἠθύμει, καὶ λογισμὸς αὐτὸν εἰσῆι τῆς ἀπορίας· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἔφη λαβεῖν οἴκοθεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ Κικέρωνι γλίσχρον ἦν ἐφόδιον· ἄμεινον οὖν εἶναι τὸν μὲν Κικέρωνα προλαμβάνειν τῇ φυγῇ, αὐτὸν δὲ μεταθεῖν οἴκοθεν συσκευασάμενον. Ταῦτ' ἔδοξε· καὶ περιλαβόντες ἀλλήλους καὶ ἀνακλυσάμενοι διελύθησαν. Ὁ μὲν οὖν Κόϊντος οὐ πολλαῖς ὕστερον ἡμέραις ὑπὸ τῶν οἰκετῶν προσδοθεὶς τοῖς ζητοῦσιν ἀνηρέθη μετὰ τοῦ παιδός. Ὁ δὲ Κικέρων εἰς

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Brut. *ad Cic.* I. 4, 6, te consulem factum audivimus; App. B. C. III. 92 ἀπελογοῖτο καὶ τὴν εἰσῆγγισιν τῆς ὑπατείας ὑπερεπῆρεν, ἣν αὐτὸς ἐν τῇ βουλῇ πρότερον εἰσηγήσατο. Ὁ δὲ τοσοῦτον ἀπεκρίνατο, ἐπισκώπτων ὅτι τῶν φίλων αὐτῷ τελευταῖος ἐντυγχάνοι.

<sup>2</sup> (A) Liv. *Perioch.* 119. 120; Vell. Pat. II. 65 ff.; Plut. *Ant.* 19; Brut. 26; App. B. C. IV. 2 ff.; Dio Cass. XLVI. 54 ff.

<sup>3</sup> (A) \* Vell. Pat. II. 66, 1; Suet. *Aug.* 27; *de vir. ill.* c. 81; Plut. *Ant.* 19, 1.

<sup>4</sup> (A) See § 94<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> Flight and death of Cicero: \* Liv. ap. Sen. *Suas.* VI. 17, 22; Asin. Poll. ap. eund. 15. 24; Val. Max. V. 3, 4; App. B. C. IV. 7 ff. esp. 19 f.; Dio Cass. XLVII. 1-10. 11; rhetores ap. Sen. *Suas.* VI. VII. *Contr.* VII. 17. *Exc.* VII. 2.

"Αστυρα κομισθεῖς καὶ πλοῖον εὐρὼν εὐθὺς ἐνέβη καὶ παρέπλευσεν ἄχρι Κιρκαίου πνεύματι χρώμενος. Ἐκεῖθεν δὲ βουλομένων εὐθὺς αἶρειν τῶν κυβερνητῶν, εἵτε δέισας τὴν θάλασσαν εἴτ' οὐπω παντάπασι τὴν Καίσαρος ἀπεγνωκῶς πίστιν, ἀπέβη καὶ παρῆλθε πεζῇ σταδίους ἑκατὸν ὡς εἰς Ῥώμην πορευόμενος. Αὐθις δ' ἁλῶν καὶ μεταβαλλόμενος κατῆι πρὸς θάλασσαν εἰς Ἀστυρα.

Κἀκεῖ διενεκτέρευσεν ἐπὶ δεινῶν καὶ ἀπύρων λογισμῶν, ὥστε καὶ παρελθεῖν εἰς τὴν Καίσαρος οἰκίαν διενοήθη κρύφα καὶ σφάξας ἑαυτὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἐστίας ἀλάστορα προσβαλεῖν.<sup>1</sup>

Ἀλλὰ καὶ ταύτης αὐτὸν ἀπέκρουσε τῆς ὁδοῦ δέος βασάνων· καὶ τὰλλα ταραχώδη καὶ παλίντροπα βουλευμάτα τῆς γνώμης μεταλαμβάνων παρέδωκε τοῖς οἰκέταις ἑαυτὸν εἰς Καπίτας κατὰ πλοῦν κομίζειν, ἔχων ἐκεῖ χωρία καὶ καταφυγὴν ὥρα θέρους φιλάνθρωπον, ὅταν ἡδιστον οἱ ἐτῆσάι καταπνέωσιν.

Ἐχει δ' ὁ τόπος καὶ ναὸν Ἀπόλλωνος μικρὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς θαλάττης. Ἐντεῦθεν ἀρθέντες ἀθρόοι κόρακες<sup>2</sup> ὑπὸ κλαγγῆς προσεφέροντο τῷ πλοίῳ τοῦ Κικέρωνος ἐπὶ γῆν ἔρεσσομένῳ· καὶ καθίσαντες ἐπὶ τὴν κεραίαν ἑκατέρωθεν οἱ μὲν ἐβόων, οἱ δ' ἔκοπτον τὰς τῶν μηρυμάτων ἀρχάς, καὶ πᾶσιν ἐδόκει τὸ σημεῖον εἶναι πονηρόν. Ἀπέβη δ' οὖν ὁ Κικέρων, καὶ παρελθὼν εἰς τὴν ἔπαυλιν ὡς ἀναπαυσόμενος κατεκλίθη. Τῶν δὲ κοράκων οἱ πολλοὶ μὲν ἐπὶ τῆς θυρίδος διεκάθηντο φθεγγόμενοι θορυβῶδες, εἰς δὲ καταβάς κατὰ τὸ κλινίδιον ἐγκεκαλυμμένου τοῦ Κικέρωνος ἀπῆγε τῷ στομάτι κατὰ μικρὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου τὸ ἱμάτιον. Οἱ δ' οἰκέται ταῦθ' ὁρῶντες καὶ κακίσαντες ἑαυτοὺς, εἰ περιμένουσι τοῦ δεσπότης φονευομένου θεαταὶ γενέσθαι, θηρία δ' αὐτῷ βοηθεῖ καὶ προκῆδεται παρ' ἀξίαν πράττοντος, αὐτοὶ δ' οὐκ ἀμύνουσι, τὰ μὲν δεόμενοι, τὰ δὲ βίᾳ λαβόντες ἐκόμιζον ἐν τῷ φορείῳ πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν.

96. XLVIII. Ἐν τούτῳ δ' οἱ σφαγεῖς ἐπῆλθον, ἑκατοντάρχης Ἑρένιος<sup>3</sup> καὶ Ποπίλλιος χιλίαρχος,<sup>3</sup> ᾧ πατροκτονίας ποτὲ δίκην φεύγοντι συνείπεν ὁ Κικέρων, ἔχοντες ὑπηρέτας.

Ἐπεὶ δὲ τὰς θύρας κεκλεισμένας εὐρόντες ἐξέκοψαν, οὐ φαινόμενον τοῦ Κικέρωνος οὐδὲ τῶν ἔνδον εἶδέναι φασκόντων,<sup>4</sup> λέγεται νεανίσκον τινα τεθραμμένον μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ Κικέρωνος ἐν γράμμασιν ἐλευθερίοις καὶ

<sup>1</sup> See p. 29.

<sup>2</sup> Val. Max. I. 4, 5; App. B. C. IV. 19; *de vir. ill.* c. 81.

<sup>3</sup> \* Hieronymus (i.e. Suetonius) is the only other writer who mentions Herennius as an assassin of Cicero: in Formiano suo ab Herennio Pompilio (sic!) occiditur. See p. 27 ff.

<sup>4</sup> (D) App. B. C. IV. 19 οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι . . . πλεῖν αὐτὸν ἐξαναχθέντα ἔλεγον ἤδη· σκυτοτόμος δὲ, πελάτης Κλωδίου, πικροτάτου τῷ Κικέρωνι ἔχθρου γεγονότος, Λαίνα τῷ λοχαγῷ σὺν ὀλίγοις ὄντι τὴν ἀτραπὸν ἔδειξεν.

μαθήμασιν, ἀπελεύθερον δὲ Κοίντου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, Φιλόλογον τοῦνομα, φράσαι τῷ χιλιάρχῳ τὸ φορεῖον κομιζόμενον διὰ τῶν καταφύτων καὶ συσκήνων περιπάτων ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν.

Ὁ μὲν οὖν χιλιάρχος ὀλίγους ἀναλαβὼν μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ περιέειπε πρὸς τὴν ἔξοδον, τοῦ δ' Ἐρενίου δρόμῳ φερομένου διὰ τῶν περιπάτων ὁ Κικέρων ᾗσθετο, καὶ τοὺς οἰκέτας ἐκέλευσεν ἐνταῦθα καταθέσθαι τὸ φορεῖον. Αὐτὸς δ', ὥσπερ εἰώθει, τῇ ἀριστερῇ χειρὶ τῶν γενείων ἀπτόμενος ἀτενὲς ἐνεώρα τοῖς σφαγεῦσιν, αὐχμοῦ καὶ κόμης ἀνάπλεως καὶ συντετηκῶς ὑπὸ φροντίδων τὸ πρόσωπον, ὥστε τοὺς πλείστους ἐγκαλύψασθαι τοῦ Ἐρενίου σφάζοντος αὐτόν.<sup>1</sup> Ἐσφάγῃ δὲ τὸν τράχηλον ἐκ τοῦ φορείου προτείνας, ἔτος ἐκείνο γεγονῶς ἐξηκοστὸν καὶ τέταρτον. Τὴν δὲ κεφαλὴν ἀπέκοψεν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰς χεῖρας, Ἀντωνίου κελεύσαντος, αἷς τοὺς Φιλιππικοὺς ἔγραψεν.<sup>2</sup> Αὐτὸς τε γὰρ ὁ Κικέρων τοὺς κατ' Ἀντωνίου λόγους Φιλιππικοὺς ἐτέγραψε καὶ μέχρι νῦν τὰ βιβλία Φιλιππικοὶ καλοῦνται.

Dec. 7.  
43 B.C.

XLIX. Τῶν δ' ἀκρωτηρίων εἰς Ῥώμην κομισθέντων ἔτυχε μὲν ἀρχαιρεσίας τελῶν ὁ Ἀντώνιος, ἀκούσας δὲ καὶ ἰδὼν ἀνεβόησεν, ὥς νῦν αἱ προγραφαὶ τέλος ἔχουσιν.<sup>3</sup>

Τὴν δὲ κεφαλὴν καὶ τὰς χεῖρας ἐκέλευσεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐμβόλων ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος θεῖναι, θέαμα Ῥωμαίοις φρικτόν,<sup>4</sup> οὐ τὸ Κικέρωνος ὄραν πρόσωπον οἰομένοις, ἀλλὰ τῆς Ἀντωνίου ψυχῆς εἰκόνα.

Πλὴν ἔν γέ τι φρονήσας μέτριον ἐν τούτοις Πομπωνίᾳ τῇ Κοίντῳ γυναικὶ τὸν Φιλόλογον παρέδωκεν. Ἡ δὲ κυρία γενομένη τοῦ σώματος ἄλλαις τε δειναῖς ἐχρήσατο τιμωρίαις, καὶ τὰς σάρκας ἀποτέμοντα τὰς αὐτοῦ κατὰ μικρὸν ὀπτᾶν, εἴτ' ἐσθίειν ἠνάγκασεν.<sup>5</sup> Οὕτω γὰρ ἔνιοι τῶν συγγραφέων ἱστορήκασιν· ὁ δ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κικέρωνος ἀπελεύθερος Τίρων τὸ παράπαν οὐδὲ μέμνηται τῆς τοῦ Φιλολόγου προδοσίας.

97. Πυνθάνομαι δὲ Καίσαρα χρόνοις πολλοῖς ὕστερον εἰσελθεῖν πρὸς ἓνα τῶν θυγατριδῶν· τὸν δὲ βιβλίον ἔχοντα Κικέρωνος ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν ἐκπλαγέντα τῷ ἱματίῳ περικαλύπτειν· ἰδόντα δὲ Καίσαρα λαβεῖν καὶ διελθεῖν ἐστῶτα μέρος πολὺ τοῦ βιβλίου, πάλιν δ' ἀποδιδόντα τῷ μεираκίῳ φάναι, “Λόγιος ἀνὴρ, ὦ παῖ, λόγιος καὶ φιλόπατρις.”

<sup>1</sup> (D) See above § 95<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> This agrees with Liv. ap. Sen. l.c.; the traditional account is given by Plutarch in *Ant.* c. 20, 1, ἐκέλευσεν Ἀντώνιος τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποκοπῆναι καὶ τὴν χεῖρα τὴν δεξιάν, ἣ τοὺς κατ' αὐτοῦ λόγους ἔγραψε.

<sup>3</sup> (A) Cremutius Cordus ap. Sen. *Suas.* l.c. 19 quibus visis laetus Antonius cum peractam proscriptionem suam dixisset esse.

<sup>4</sup> Cp. § 95<sup>5</sup>; Florus IV. 6, 5.

<sup>5</sup> (D) Dio Cass. XLVII. 8, 3.



- 30 B.C. 98. Ἐπεὶ μέντοι τάχιστα κατεπολέμησεν Ἀντώνιον ὑπατεύων αὐτὸς εἴλετο συνάρχοντα τοῦ Κικέρωνος τὸν υἱόν,<sup>1</sup> ἐφ' οὗ τὰς τ' εἰκόνας ἢ βουλὴ καθέλειν Ἀντωνίου καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἠκύρωσε τιμὰς καὶ προσεψηφίσατο μηδενὶ τῶν Ἀντωνίων ὄνομα Μάρκον εἶναι. Οὕτω τὸ δαιμόνιον εἰς τὸν Κικέρωνος οἶκον ἐπανήνεγκε τὸ τέλος τῆς Ἀντωνίου κολάσεως.<sup>2</sup>

## COMPARISON OF DEMOSTHENES AND CICERO

99. I. Ἄ μὲν οὖν ἄξια μνήμης τῶν περὶ Δημοσθένους καὶ Κικέρωνος ἱστορουμένων εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀφίκεται γνῶσιν, ταῦτ' ἐστίν.

Ἀφεικῶς δὲ τὸ συγκρίνειν τὴν ἐν τοῖς λόγοις ἔξιν αὐτῶν ἐκεῖνό μοι δοκῶ μὴ παρήσειν ἄρρητον, ὅτι Δημοσθένης μὲν εἰς τὸ ῥητορικὸν ἐνέτεινε πᾶν, ὅσον εἶχεν ἐκ φύσεως ἢ ἀσκήσεως λόγιον, ὑπερβαλλόμενος ἐναργεῖα μὲν καὶ δεινότητι τοὺς ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγῶνων καὶ τῶν δικῶν συνεξεταζομένους, ὅγκῳ δὲ καὶ μεγαλοπρεπείᾳ τοὺς ἐπιδεικτικούς, ἀκριβεῖα δὲ καὶ τέχνη τοὺς σοφιστάς.

100. Κικέρων δὲ καὶ πολυμαθὴς καὶ ποικίλος τῇ περὶ τοὺς λόγους σπουδῇ γενόμενος συντάξεις μὲν ἰδίας φιλοσόφους ἀπολέλοιπεν οὐκ ὀλίγας εἰς τὸν Ἀκαδημαϊκὸν τρόπον, οὗ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τῶν πρὸς τὰς δίκας καὶ τοὺς ἀγῶνας γραφομένων λόγων δηλὸς ἐστὶν ἐμπειρίαν τινὰ γραμμάτων παρεπιδείκνυσθαι βουλόμενος.<sup>3</sup>

Ἔστι δέ τις καὶ τοῦ ἥθους ἐν τοῖς λόγοις ἐκατέρου δίοψις. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ Δημοσθενικὸς ἔξω παντὸς ὥραϊσμοῦ καὶ παιδιᾶς εἰς δεινότητα καὶ σπουδὴν συνηγμένος οὐκ ἐλλυχνίων ὁδῶδεν, ὥσπερ ὁ Πυθέας ἔσκωπτεν, ἀλλ' ἰδροποσίας καὶ φροντίδων καὶ τῆς λεγομένης πικρίας τοῦ τρόπου καὶ στυγνότητος,

101. Κικέρων δὲ πολλαχοῦ τῷ σκωπτικῷ πρὸς τὸ βωμολόχον ἐκφερόμενος καὶ πράγματα σπουδῆς ἄξια γέλῳτι καὶ παιδιᾷ κατειρωνεύμενος ἐν ταῖς δίκαις εἰς τὸ χρεῖῳδες ἠφείδει τοῦ πρέποντος, ὥσπερ ἐν τῇ Καιλίου συνηγορίᾳ μηδὲν ἄτοπον ποιεῖν αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ

<sup>1</sup> (A) Sen. *de benef.* IV. 30, 1; App. *B. C.* IV. 51; Dio LI. 19, 3.

<sup>2</sup> (A) Dio l.c. τὰ τοῦ Ἀντωνίου κοσμήματα τὰ μὲν καθέλλον, τὰ δ' ἀπήλειψαν . . . τὸ τοῦ Μάρκου πρόσρημα ἀπέειπον μηδενὶ τῶν συγγενῶν αὐτοῦ εἶναι . . . τοῦτ' ἐπεὶ τινες ὡς οὐκ ἄθεε δὴ συμβὰν ἐλάμβανον etc.

<sup>3</sup> This statement is unjust and must be attributed to some post-Augustan Ciceromastix. For Plutarch it would, moreover, imply too exhaustive a knowledge of the works of Cicero. Cp. p. 39 f.

τροφῇ καὶ πολυτελείᾳ ταῖς ἡδοναῖς χρώμενον· τὸ γὰρ ὧν ἔξεστι μὴ μετέχειν, μανικὸν εἶναι, καὶ ταῦτα ἐν ἡδονῇ τὸ εὐδαιμον τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων φιλοσόφων τιθεμένων.<sup>1</sup>

102. Λέγεται<sup>2</sup> δὲ Κάτωνος Μουρῆναν διώκοντος ὑπατεύων ἀπολογεῖσθαι καὶ πολλὰ διὰ τὸν Κάτωνα κωμῶδειν τὴν Στωϊκὴν αἵρεσιν ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀτοπίαις τῶν παραδόξων λεγομένων δογμάτων· γέλωτος δὲ λαμπροῦ κατιόντος ἐκ τῶν περιεστώτων πρὸς τοὺς δικαστάς, ἡσυχῇ διαμειδιῶσας [ὁ Κάτων\*] πρὸς τοὺς καθημένους εἰπεῖν· “Ὡς γελοῖον, ὦ ἄνδρες, ἔχομεν ὑπατον.” Δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ γέλωτος οἰκείος ὁ Κικέρων γεγονέναι καὶ φιλοσκώπτῃς, τό τε πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ μειδίαμα καὶ γαλήνην παρέιχε.<sup>3</sup>

Τῷ δὲ Δημοσθένους αἰεὶ τις ἐπὶ σπουδῇ, καὶ τὸ πεφροντικὸς τοῦτο καὶ σύννουν οὐ ῥᾶδίως ἀπέλιπεν· ὅθεν καὶ δύσκολον αὐτὸν οἱ ἐχθροὶ καὶ δίστροπον, ὡς αὐτὸς φησιν, ἀπεκάλουν.

II. Ἐτι τοῖνυν ἐν τοῖς συγγράμμασι κατιδεῖν ἔστι τὸν μὲν ἐμμελῶς καὶ ἀνεπαχθῶς τῶν εἰς αὐτὸν ἀπτόμενον ἐγκωμίων, ὅτε τούτου δεῖται πρὸς ἕτερόν τι μείζον, τᾶλλα δ' εὐλαβῆ καὶ μέτριον·

103. ἡ δὲ Κικέρωνος ἐν τοῖς λόγοις ἀμετρία τῆς περιαντολογίας ἀκρασίαν τινὰ κατηγόρει πρὸς δόξαν βοῶντος, ὡς τὰ ὅπλα ἔδει τῇ τηβέννῳ καὶ τῇ γλώττῃ τὴν θριαμβικὴν ὑπέκκειν δάφνην.<sup>4</sup>

Τελευτῶν δ' οὐ τὰ ἔργα καὶ τὰς πράξεις μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς λόγους ἐπαινεῖ τοὺς εἰρημένους ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ γεγραμμένους, ὥσπερ Ἰσοκράτει καὶ Ἀναξιμένει τοῖς σοφισταῖς διαμειρακιενόμενος, οὐ τὸν Ῥωμαῖον δῆμον ἄγειν ἀξίων καὶ ὀρθοῦν,

βριθύν, ὀπλιτοπάλαν, δάϊον ἀντιπάλοις.

Ἰσχύειν μὲν γὰρ διὰ λόγον τὸν πολιτευόμενον ἀναγκαῖον, ἀγαπᾶν δ' ἀγεννὲς καὶ λιχνεύειν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ λόγου δόξαν. Ὅθεν ἐμβριθέστερος ταύτῃ καὶ μεγαλοπρεπέστατος ὁ Δημοσθένης, τὴν μὲν αὐτοῦ δύναμιν ἐμπειρίαν τινὰ πολλῆς δεομένην τῆς παρὰ τῶν ἀκρωμένων εὐνοίας ἀποφαινόμενος, ἀνελευθέρους δὲ καὶ βαναύσους, ὥσπερ εἰσὶ, τοὺς ἐπὶ τούτῳ φυσσωμένους ἡγούμενος.

<sup>1</sup> Probably refers to 12, 28 ff., but 17, 39 f. is sufficient to show that Pl. never read this speech. See also p. 65.

<sup>2</sup> (A) Cp. also Plut. *Cat. Min.* 21, 2.

<sup>3</sup> (A) Pollio ap. Sen. *Suas.* VI. 24 *facies decora*.

<sup>4</sup> = *Cedant arma togae, concedat laurea linguae* (Cicero: *laudi*). This line, ridiculed by contemporaries and later writers, is energetically defended by Cicero himself (*in Pis.* 29, 72-30, 75; *Phil.* II. 8, 20; *de off.* I. 22, 77). Plutarch cannot, therefore, have read these works. It is, moreover, the only quotation of a Latin verse in his writings. See also p. 182. The reading *linguae* (Quint. IX. 4, 41; Ps. Sall. *Invect. in Cic.* 3, 6) seems to be the emendation of a rhetorician. If so, it would furnish another proof against a pre-Augustan origin of Plutarch's information.

III. Ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐν τῷ δημηγορεῖν καὶ πολιτεύεσθαι δύναμις ὁμαλῶς ἀμφοτέροις ὑπῆρξεν, ὥστε καὶ τοὺς τῶν ὄπλων καὶ στρατοπέδων κυρίου δέεσθαι, Δημοσθένους μὲν Χάρητα καὶ Διοπίεθιν καὶ Λεωσθένην, Κικέρωνος δὲ Πομπήϊον καὶ Καῖσαρα τὸν νέον, ὡς αὐτὸς ὁ Καῖσαρ ἐν τοῖς πρὸς Ἀγρίππαν καὶ Μαικίην ὑπομνήμασιν εἴρηκεν. Ὁ δὲ δοκεῖ μάλιστα καὶ λέγεται τρόπον ἀνδρὸς ἐπιδεικνύναι καὶ βασανίζειν, ἐξουσία καὶ ἀρχὴ πᾶν πάθος κινουσα καὶ πᾶσαν ἀποκαλύπτουσα κακίαν, Δημοσθέnei μὲν οὐχ ὑπῆρξεν, οὐδ' ἔδωκε τοιαύτην διάπειραν ἑαυτοῦ μηδεμίαν ἀρχὴν τῶν ἐπιφανῶν ἀρέας, ὃς οὐδὲ τῆς ὑφ' αὐτοῦ συντεταγμένης ἐπὶ Φίλιππον ἐστρατήγησε δυνάμεως.

104. Κικέρων δὲ ταμίης εἰς Σικελίαν καὶ ἀνθύπατος εἰς Κιλικίαν καὶ Καππαδοκίαν ἀποσταλείς, ἐν ᾧ καιρῷ τῆς φιλοπλουτίας ἀκμαζούσης, καὶ τῶν πεμπομένων στρατηγῶν καὶ ἡγεμόνων, ὡς τοῦ κλέπτειν ἀγεννοῦς ὄντος, ἐπὶ τὸ ἀρπάζειν τρεπομένων, οὐ τὸ λαμβάνειν ἐδόκει δεινόν, ἀλλ' ὁ μετριῶς τοῦτο ποιῶν ἡγαπᾶτο, πολλὴν μὲν ἐπίδειξιν ὑπεροφίας χρημάτων ἐποίησατο, πολλὴν δὲ φιλανθρωπίας καὶ χρηστότητος.<sup>1</sup>

105. Ἐν αὐτῇ δὲ τῇ Ῥώμῃ λόγῳ μὲν ἀποδειχθεὶς ὑπατος, ἐξουσίαν δὲ λαβὼν αὐτοκράτορος καὶ δικτάτορος ἐπὶ τοὺς περὶ Κατιλίαν, ἐμαρτύρησεν ἅμα τῷ Πλάτωνι μαντευομένῳ παῦλαν ἕξιν κακῶν τὰς πόλεις, ὅταν εἰς ταῦτ' οὐκ ἐκείνην τε μεγάλη καὶ φρόνησις ἔκ τινος τύχης χρηστῆς ἀπαντήσῃ μετὰ δικαιοσύνης.

Χρηματίσασθαι τοῖνυν ἀπὸ τοῦ λόγου Δημοσθένους μὲν ἐπιφύγως λέγεται, λογογραφῶν κρύφα τοῖς περὶ Φορμίωνα καὶ Ἀπολλόδωρον ἀντιδίοις, καὶ διαβληθεὶς μὲν ἐπὶ τοῖς βασιλικαῖς χρήμασιν, ὀφλὼν δὲ τῶν Ἀρπαλείων. Εἰ δὲ ταῦτα τοὺς γράφοντας (οὐκ ὀλίγοι δ' εἰσὶν οὗτοι) ψεύδεσθαι φαίμεν, ἀλλ' ὅτι γε πρὸς δωρεὰς βασιλέων σὺν χάριτι καὶ τιμῇ διδομένας ἀντιβλέψαι Δημοσθένους οὐκ ἂν ἐτόλμησεν, οὐδ' ἦν τοῦτο τὸ ἔργον ἀνθρώπου δανείζοντος ἐπὶ ναυτικοῖς, ἀμήχανον ἀντειπεῖν· περὶ δὲ Κικέρωνος, ὅτι καὶ Σικελιωτῶν ἀγορανομοῦντι καὶ βασιλέως τοῦ Καππαδοκῶν ἀνθυπατεύοντι καὶ τῶν ἐν Ῥώμῃ φίλων, ὅτ' ἐξέπιπτε τῆς πόλεως, δωρουμένων πολλὰ καὶ δεομένων λαβεῖν ἀντέσχεν, εἴρηται.

IV. Καὶ μὴν ἡ γε φυγὴ τῷ μὲν αἰσχυρὰ κλοπῆς ἀλόντι συνέπεσε, τῷ δὲ κάλλιστον ἔργον ἀνθρώπων ἀλιτηρίους ἐκκόψαντι τῆς πατρίδος. Διὸ τοῦ μὲν οὐδεὶς λόγος ἐκπίπτοντος, ἐφ' ᾧ δ' ἡ σύγκλητος ἐσθῆτά τε διήλλαξε καὶ πένθος ἔσχε καὶ γνώμην ὑπὲρ οὐδενὸς εἰπεῖν ἐπέισθη πρότερον ἢ Κικέρωνι κάθοδον ψηφίσασθαι.

106. Τὴν μέντοι φυγὴν ἀργῶς ὁ Κικέρων διήνεγκεν ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ καθήμενος,

τῷ δὲ Δημοσθέnei καὶ ἡ φυγὴ μέγα μέρος τῆς πολιτείας γέγονε. Συναγωνιζόμενος γάρ, ὥσπερ εἴρηται, τοῖς Ἑλλησι καὶ τοὺς Μακεδόνας

<sup>1</sup> See §§ 25. 28. 70.



πρέσβεις ἐξελαύνων ἐπήρχετο τὰς πόλεις, πολὺ βελτίων Θεμιστοκλέους καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδου παρὰ τὰς αὐτὰς τύχας φανείς πολίτης· καὶ μέντοι κατελθὼν αὐθις ἑαυτὸν ἐπέδωκεν εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν ταύτην πολιτείαν καὶ διετέλει πολεμῶν πρὸς Ἀντίπατρον καὶ Μακεδόνας.

107. Κικέρωνα δ' ὠνείδισεν ἐν τῇ βουλῇ Λαίλιος αἰτουμένου Καίσαρος ὑπατείαν μετιέναι παρὰ νόμον, οὕτω γενειῶντος, σιωπῇ καθήμενον. Ἐγραφε δὲ καὶ Βροῦτος<sup>1</sup> ἐγκαλῶν ὡς μείζονα καὶ βαρυντέραν πεπαιδοτριβηκότει τυραννίδα τῆς ὑφ' αὐτοῦ καταλυθείσης.

108. V. Ἐπὶ πᾶσι δὲ τῆς τελευτῆς τὸν μὲν οἰκτεῖραι τις ἄν, ἄνδρα πρεσβύτην δι' ἀγένειαν ὑπὸ οἰκετῶν ἄνω καὶ κάτω περιφερόμενον καὶ περιφεύγοντα τὸν θάνατον καὶ ἀποκρυπτόμενον τοὺς οὐ πολὺ πρὸ τῆς φύσεως ἤκοντας ἐπ' αὐτόν, εἴτ' ἀποσφαγέντα.<sup>2</sup> τοῦ δ', εἰ καὶ μικρὰ πρὸς τὴν ἰκετείαν ἐνέδωκεν, ἀγαστὴ μὲν ἢ παρασκευὴ τοῦ φαρμάκου καὶ τήρησις, ἀγαστὴ δ' ἢ χρήσις, ὅτι τοῦ θεοῦ μὴ παρασχόντος αὐτῷ τὴν ἀσυλίαν, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ μείζονα βωμὸν καταφυγών, ἐκ τῶν ὅπλων καὶ τῶν δορυφόρων λαβὼν ἑαυτὸν ᾤχετο, τῆς Ἀντιπάτρου καταγελάσας ὠμότητος.

<sup>1</sup> Brut. *ad Cíc.* I. 16; *ad Att.* I. 17.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. *Iuv.* X. 118 ff.; *Ps. Quint. Decl.* 268; *Tac. Dial.* c. 40 ext. (see my note p. 374).

## APPENDIX II

### M. TULLIUS CICERO

(Anon. *de viris illustribus* c. 81)

M. Tullius Cicero, genere Arpinas, patre equite Romano natus, genus a Tullo Attio rege duxit.<sup>1</sup> Adolescens<sup>2</sup> Rosciano iudicio<sup>3</sup> eloquentiam et libertatem suam adversus Sullanos ostendit,<sup>4</sup> ex quo veritus invidiam<sup>5</sup> Athenas studiorum gratia petivit,<sup>6</sup> ubi Antiochum<sup>7</sup> Academicum philosophum studiose audivit.<sup>8</sup> Inde eloquentiae gratia<sup>9</sup> Asiam,<sup>10</sup> post Rhodum petiit,<sup>11</sup> ubi Molonem, Graecum rhetorem, tum disertissimum, magistrum habuit<sup>12</sup> qui flesse dicitur quod per hunc Graecia eloquentiae laude privaretur.<sup>13</sup> Quaestor Siciliam habuit.<sup>14</sup> Aedilis C. Verrem repetundarum damnavit.<sup>15</sup> Praetor<sup>16</sup> Ciliciam latrocinii liberavit.<sup>17</sup> Consul coniuratos capite punivit.<sup>18</sup> Mox invidia P. Clodii<sup>19</sup> instinctuque Caesaris et Pompei<sup>20</sup> quos dominationis suspectos eadem qua quondam Sullanos libertate perstrinxerat, sollicitatis Pisone et Gabinio consulibus qui Macedoniam Asiamque provincias in stipendium opera huius acceperant,<sup>21</sup> in exsilium actus;<sup>22</sup> mox ipso referente Pompeio<sup>23</sup> rediit<sup>24</sup> eumque civili bello secutus est.<sup>25</sup> Quo victo<sup>26</sup> veniam a Caesare ultro accepit;<sup>27</sup> quo interfecto<sup>28</sup> Augustum fovit,<sup>29</sup> Antonium hostem iudicavit.<sup>30</sup> Et cum triumphos se fecissent Caesar, Lepidus Antoniusque,<sup>31</sup> concordia non aliter visa est inter eos iungi posse, nisi Tullius necaretur,<sup>32</sup> qui immissis ab Antonio percussoribus,<sup>33</sup> cum forte Formiis quiesceret, imminens exitium corvi auspicio<sup>34</sup> didicit et fugiens occisus est.<sup>35</sup> Caput ad Antonium relatum.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Plut. *Cic.* c. 1

<sup>2</sup> c. 3

<sup>3</sup> c. 3

<sup>4</sup> c. 3

<sup>5</sup> c. 3

<sup>6</sup> c. 4

<sup>7</sup> c. 4

<sup>8</sup> c. 4

<sup>9</sup> c. 4

<sup>10</sup> c. 4

<sup>11</sup> c. 4

<sup>12</sup> c. 4

<sup>13</sup> c. 4

<sup>14</sup> c. 6

<sup>15</sup> c. 7 f.

<sup>16</sup> c. 9

<sup>17</sup> See p. 54<sup>15</sup>

<sup>18</sup> c. 10-23

<sup>19</sup> c. 28 f.

<sup>20</sup> c. 30

<sup>21</sup> c. 30

<sup>22</sup> c. 30 f.

<sup>23</sup> c. 33

<sup>24</sup> c. 33

<sup>25</sup> c. 37 f.

<sup>26</sup> c. 39

<sup>27</sup> c. 39

<sup>28</sup> c. 42

<sup>29</sup> c. 44

<sup>30</sup> c. 45

<sup>31</sup> c. 46

<sup>32</sup> c. 46 f.

<sup>33</sup> c. 47 f.

<sup>34</sup> c. 47

<sup>35</sup> c. 48

<sup>36</sup> c. 48 f.

## APPENDIX III

PLUT. DEM. 2. 3'

(See p. 4.)

Τῷ μέντοι σύνταξιν ὑποβεβλημένῳ καὶ ἱστορίαν ἐξ οὗ προχείρων οὐδ' οἰκείων, ἀλλὰ ξένων τε τῶν πολλῶν καὶ διεσπαρμένων ἐν ἑτέροις συνιοῦσαν ἀναγνωσμάτων τῷ ὄντι χρῆ πρῶτον ὑπάρχειν καὶ μάλιστα τὴν πόλιν εὐδόκιμον καὶ φιλόκαλον καὶ πολυάνθρωπον, ὡς βιβλίων τε παντοδαπῶν ἀφθονίαν ἔχων, καὶ ὅσα τοὺς γράφοντας διαφεύγοντα σωτηρίᾳ μνήμης ἐπιφανεστέραν εἵληφε πίστιν ὑπολαμβάνων ἀκοῇ καὶ διαπυνθανόμενος, μὴ πολλῶν μῆδ' ἀναγκαίων ἐνδεῆς ἀποδιδοίη τὸ ἔργον. Ἡμεῖς δὲ μικρὰν οἰκοῦντες πόλιν, καὶ ἵνα μὴ μικροτέρα γένηται φιλοχωροῦντες, ἐν δὲ Ῥώμῃ καὶ ταῖς περὶ τὴν Ἰταλίαν διατριβαῖς οὐ σχολῆς οὔσης γυμνάζεσθαι περὶ τὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν διάλεκτον ὑπὸ χρείων πολιτικῶν καὶ τῶν διὰ φιλοσοφίαν πλησιαζόντων, ὅψέ ποτε καὶ πόρρω τῆς ἡλικίας ἡρξάμεθα Ῥωμαῖκοῖς γράμμασιν ἐντυγχάνειν. Καὶ πρᾶγμα θαυμαστὸν μὲν, ἀλλ' ἀληθὲς ἐπάσχομεν. Οὐ γὰρ οὕτως ἐκ τῶν ὀνομάτων τὰ πράγματα συνίηαι καὶ γνωρίζειν συνέβαιεν ἡμῖν, ὡς ἐκ τῶν πραγμάτων ἀμῶς γέ πως εἶχομεν ἐμπειρίας ἐπακολουθεῖν διὰ ταῦτα καὶ τοῖς ὀνόμασι. Κάλους δὲ Ῥωμαϊκῆς ἀπαγγελίας καὶ τάχους αἰσθάνεσθαι καὶ μεταφορᾶς ὀνομάτων καὶ ἁρμονίας καὶ τῶν ἄλλων, οἷς ὁ λόγος ἀγάλλεται, χάριεν μὲν ἡγοῦμεθα καὶ οὐκ ἀτερπές· ἡ δὲ πρὸς τοῦτο μελέτη καὶ ἄσκησις οὐκ εὐχερής, ἀλλ' οἷστίσι πλείων τε σχολὴ καὶ τὰ τῆς ὥρας ἔτι πρὸς τὰς τοιαύτας ἐπιχωρεῖ φιλοτιμίας.

Διὸ καὶ γράφοντες ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ, τῶν παραλλήλων βίων ὄντι πέμπτῳ, περὶ Δημοσθένους καὶ Κικέρωνος, ἀπὸ τῶν πράξεων καὶ τῶν πολιτειῶν τὰς φύσεις αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς διαθέσεις πρὸς ἀλλήλας ἐπισκεψόμεθα, τὸ δὲ τοὺς λόγους ἀντεξετάζειν καὶ ἀποφαίνεσθαι, πότερος ἡδίων ἢ δεινότερος εἰπεῖν, εἰσομέν. Κακῇ γάρ, ὥς φησιν ὁ Ἴων, “δελφίνος ἐν χέρσῳ βία,” ἣν ὁ περιττὸς ἐν ἅπασι Κεκίλιος ἀγνοήσας ἐνεανιεύσατο σύγκρισιν τοῦ Δημοσθένους καὶ Κικέρωνος ἐξενεγκεῖν. Ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἴσως, εἰ παντὸς ἦν τὸ “Γνωθὶ σαντὸν” ἔχειν πρόχειρον, οὐκ ἂν ἐδόκει πρόσταγμα θεῶν εἶναι.











P  
25  
P5  
v.8  
no.2

Pennsylvania. University  
Series in philology and  
literature

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE  
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

---

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

---

CIRCULATE AS MONOGRAPH

